

Transport Committee – 10 December 2014

Transcript of Item 5 – Cycling in London

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Our main item on the agenda today is for us to look at cycling in London and to look at how the Mayor's Vision for Cycling is being delivered and what progress is being made.

We have a fantastic panel before us today. I am really delighted. We have Andrew Gilligan here before us again, who is the Mayor's Cycling Commissioner. Councillor Julian Bell is the newish Chair of the Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) at London Councils. We worked closely with your predecessor and so we look forward to working with you, Julian. We have Iain Simmons here today, who is the Assistant Director City Transportation at the City of London Corporation. With you we have Michael Welbank, who is the Chair of the Planning and Transportation Committee at the City of London Corporation. We have Dr Rachel Aldred, who is a Senior Transport Lecturer at the University of Westminster and also Chair of the Policy Forum at the London Cycling Campaign (LCC) and doing some great work there. We are very honoured to have Chris Boardman before us today, who is a former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor for British Cycling. Then Joe Irvin is the new Chief Executive at Living Streets, whom we also work closely with. You are very welcome today. We are delighted to have you here to talk about this really important issue for us.

I am going to kick off the questioning and first of all I want to focus on the East-West Superhighway, which has had a lot of media coverage and a lot of interest. There was a huge number; 20,000 responses to the public consultation. I am sure that is probably unprecedented at Transport for London (TfL). I will perhaps start with Andrew and will bring others in on the importance, you think, of this East-West Superhighway to the actual overall success of the Mayor's Cycling Vision.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It is the centrepiece of the entire programme and without it quite a lot of the routes in central London and in London as a whole will not work. One of the key problems with cycling in central London is the gap in cyclable roads presented by the City. That is just a function of the fact that all the east-west roads in the City of London are main roads. There are no low-traffic side streets that are usable by cyclists and anyone wanting to pass through the City east-west has to use a main road. This will for the first time give those people - who are in very substantial numbers, particularly given the growth of cycling and the gentrification of east London - a safe route through the City.

As you know, it will run for 18 miles. It will link the existing Cycle Superhighway 3 from Barking and Canary Wharf to the Tower. At the moment, it simply stops dead at a rather nasty gyratory. It will take you right through that on a segregated track, along Upper and Lower Thames Streets to the Victoria Embankment and Parliament Square and then out to the west. It is a hugely important route.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Brilliant. I wonder whether Rachel from the LCC, as an academic, in your point of view, how important do you think it is. Obviously, the statement - and the draft is out at the moment - shows a lot of segregation in it as well.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Yes. Symbolically, these routes are so important because they will be very visible in the heart of London as well as having the practical function that Andrew [Gilligan] mentioned. The evidence is very clear now that people are not going to cycle in large numbers unless we have these kinds of routes and unless we have the

high-quality segregation that TfL has proposed. These routes from a transport planning perspective really mark a big step forward. If these routes do not go ahead, we will be moving backwards in terms of cycle. If these routes go ahead, we are on the way to London becoming a cyclable city and so it is as important as that, yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Fantastic. Chris, from British Cycling's point of view, is it like a game-changer having something so strategic through central London?

Chris Boardman MBE (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): We are drowning in evidence. The Get Britain Cycling report made it utterly clear that people are not going to change. This is not for cyclists. That is what we need to be clear about. This is for people who do not cycle now and we want them to. This is for normal people in normal clothes doing normal things. They will not take that up. All the surveys that we have done have said they will not take that up unless they have space to do so and unless they feel safe. It does not matter if the statistics say it is safe. It does not look it; it does not feel it. This is absolutely critical.

It is more than just London, which is why I am here. This is about setting a precedent for the rest of the country. The commitment that has been shown to measurable targets is absolutely fantastic and we are very much behind it.

For the first time, we are going to see cycling infrastructure that is properly joined up all the way through from the start to the finish of the journey. The other thing we often do not do is we have chunks of infrastructure and this is actually going to make it a pathway all the way through the city and so it is fascinating --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Do you see it as London leading the way on this?

Chris Boardman MBE (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): London is very much leading the way and this is the biggest cycling initiative in this country, possibly ever, with a proper long-term commitment, meaningful sums of money and targets that we can measure and hold each other and the city accountable for, and that is proper leadership. If it should happen anywhere in this country, it has to be in London. When we can measure the effect of that and the positive impact - not just for people who ride bikes but for pollution, congestion and all the other things - then it will be very hard for anybody who does not want to not to implement that on a wider scale around the country.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you for that. I know the City of London has had some concerns about aspects of the East-West Superhighway. I do not know whether maybe, Michael, as Chair, you might like to comment on what your concerns are with it.

Michael Welbank MBE (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee, City of London Corporation): Thank you. We support the segregated cycle route through London.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Fantastic.

Michael Welbank MBE (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee, City of London Corporation): Yes, we do. I want to make that absolutely clear. We have always expressed that support.

What we have concerns about is the particular design that has been presented because it has raised some concerns in relation to pedestrians and the increased dangers and the reduced level of safety in certain places.

These concerns we have listed, some 13 concerns, and our disappointment has been with TfL. Although we have had several series of meetings with them or our officers have, these have resulted in very little done to address those concerns. It has become quite serious because we have a responsibility for the thousands of people who walk along our streets. It is not that we are anti-cyclists. We are for cyclists. However, we are also for the safety of all road users and we believe that some of the concerns we expressed disadvantage other users of those spaces.

In fact, in my view, it has become quite serious because although we have put down our concerns in a first response to TfL on 12 November 2014, progress has been nil. In fact, we have been told, "It is now fixed", or words to that effect. In fact, the Chair of our Policy [and Resources] Committee has now written to Boris [Johnson, Mayor of London] to say, "Look, we want to be able to go to our committees soon and say, 'Look, here it is and we support it', but as they stand at the moment we would have difficulty in getting committees to express outright support for the scheme". We want to support the scheme. We want to see our concerns being overcome. Most of them can be overcome without damage to the overall concept. However, without them, we are going to have difficulty getting full-blooded support from the City and that is what we want to achieve if we can.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Just a few adjustments, you are saying, are needed to make this work for you and your residents and businesspeople who walk through the City every day?

Michael Welbank MBE (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee, City of London Corporation): Yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Joe, did you want to come in on the pedestrian point of view because that is an issue that has been raised? Do you think they have a detrimental impact on pedestrians?

Joe Irvin (Chief Executive, Living Streets): Can I first of all say that Living Streets are obviously about walking, about pedestrians, not about cycling? However, we are very supportive of the proposal because we want it to be easier and safer to walk and cycle here and everywhere else. Chris [Boardman] and I were at an event in Bristol and we were absolutely shoulder-to-shoulder supporting that.

In 99% of the time, what is good for cyclists is good for people walking and vice-versa, but 1% of the time there are conflicts. The answer to that is to try to find the design ways to get around those. There are sensible ways to get around those and we have become quite good at doing that. We are very supportive of the whole venture. It is really imaginative. It is a game-changer. Because it is such a big thing, it is probably worth getting right.

Our concerns about pedestrians are in three areas. Firstly, it is those areas where pedestrians have to cross the cycle routes and making sure that those are amenable.

Secondly, there is a particular concern about some of what are termed 'floating bus stops'. I have an illustration of those here. For those who are not familiar, it means that you are standing on a pavement, the bus is stopping there and there is actually a cycle path in the way. You just need to be very careful about doing that in the right place and with the right numbers, bearing in mind that the purpose of this is to vastly increase the numbers of people cycling. It is not current rates of cycling. You have to get this right for people and probably, if there are a million more people in London, there will be more people catching the buses as well. Let us try to make it so that it is good for all of those people.

The third thing is crossing times. There are certain specific places where there are crossing times being proposed that we think are unreasonable. I think the City agrees with that. When you are asking people to wait 120 seconds to cross, studies show that people actually will not wait that long and they will start to cross. That is just asking for accidents to happen. It is having reasonable and best-practice crossing times. In fact, we would rather see people able to cross. This is the waiting time to cross that I am talking about. It is not the time to cross the road, but how long you are waiting at a red light to cross --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): It is the crossing time, yes.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): Between cycles, yes.

Joe Irvin (Chief Executive, Living Streets): -- and 120 seconds is just too long.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Two minutes, yes. That is fair. That is a good point. Before I bring Andrew [Gilligan] in to respond to some of this, Julian, from a borough perspective, what impact do you think the Superhighway is going to have on overall traffic congestion and this that something that you and the boroughs are concerned about?

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): Absolutely. Firstly, I will just say how much we would welcome it. However, there are some differing opinions and therefore London Councils did not put in a detailed submission. We are obviously enthusiastically, in principle, behind it. There were concerns from some boroughs, as we have heard from the City, in terms of the impact on road traffic, deliveries and business. Equally, boroughs have raised concerns about how rigorous the modelling data is and boroughs have made the point that when they have to provide data for cycling schemes on their roads, it is much more detailed. That is the specific.

On the broader issue of tackling congestion and what Chris [Boardman] said in terms of how it is about those people who are not cycling and trying to make cycling feel safer for people, many of those people who are not cycling at the moment are motorists. If you can get people out of their cars and onto cycles, you free up more road space for the people who do want to continue to drive cars. However, actually, everyone benefits if you can get that modal shift and get people onto bicycles.

The other point to make is it is incredible value for money. If you compare all of the other costs of transport infrastructure, whether it is Tube lines or roads or putting in a Cycle Superhighway or a Quietway or whatever it is, it is incredible value for money. Chris [Boardman] did an excellent piece in the summer and I cannot remember exactly the numbers --

Chris Boardman MBE (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): It cannot have been that good, then!

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): I cannot remember the numbers, but it was the equivalent of an extra Tube train every so many minutes or whatever if you can get that modal shift. Air quality is a big issue in London as well. All of this will contribute to tackling that particular problem and all the health issues related to it. Of course, if you cycle, you get healthier as well. We need to push this as hard as we can.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): It sounds to me from everyone that this is absolutely win-win and it is just about getting some of the detail right. Andrew, are you actually going to be making some of these

adjustments and things, such as around the pedestrian crossings and other issues, to make sure this works? Also, Canary Wharf Group has emailed me saying that its position had been misrepresented in the press but it was keen to point out that it had put forward an alternative route to you. Is this seriously being considered?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): We are very keen indeed to work with people like the City and Living Streets to iron out some of the details and we are doing that now. As you know, the purpose of the consultation exercise is to consult. We have already made changes to some of our other schemes. For instance, the Cycle Superhighway 5 scheme through Vauxhall, in response to concerns expressed at the consultation stage, had fairly significant changes, actually, changes which make it better for both pedestrians and cyclists. That is an indication of our flexibility in these sorts of matters.

Regarding some of the pedestrian points, on the East-West Superhighway there are going to be 14 new pedestrian crossings on the East-West alone and 25 of the existing crossings will be made shorter and quicker to cross. At the moment, you have to wait in the middle of the road quite a lot of the time. They are 'two-stage crossings' in the jargon. Actually, you are going to be able to walk straight across the road in the future. Therefore, there are a lot of benefits for pedestrians. There is also a great deal more pedestrian space with about 4,000 square metres on the East-West.

A handful of maximum crossing times are going to be longer and I have them here. The longest one is going to be nine seconds maximum longer to wait than it is now. It is at Parliament Square and Bridge Street and is going from 105 seconds to 114 seconds.

Victoria Borwick AM: If they are very busy, they will not wait for that.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Most of them are not changing or are getting shorter.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): You are saying they are about the same as what they are now? Two minutes to cross, though, is quite a long time.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I think it is one of the ones on the North-South that is going up to a maximum of 120 seconds: Ludgate Circus. The East-West ones where they are going up, which is not in the majority of cases, are going up by a maximum of 9 seconds. As I say, a large number of crossing times are going down and a large number of new crossings are being provided. Therefore, overall, this is very substantially beneficial for pedestrians.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): You are listening and prepared to work with the City and others to just adjust these things where necessary to get them right, yes?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Yes.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): That is a strong commitment. Michael, do you want to respond?

Michael Welbank MBE (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee, City of London Corporation): Yes. We have just talked about the number of seconds by which they are going to increase or decrease. However, coming back to the points that have been made about the actual delay time, we believe that there should be no longer than 88 seconds for the cycle to go through the crossing because we believe that is the sort of level - and we know from experience - that pedestrians can cope with. If we get large numbers of pedestrians, they will burst through those times and will start crossing. I believe what was talked

about was how much it has gone up or down, but what it actually is that we ought to aim at no more than 88 seconds.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): That is a slightly different point, to be fair, because what is being asked for there is a reduction in the cycle time now. Quite a lot of the cycle times on the East-West are more than 88 seconds now.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Michael [Welbank] is saying that to get this right for the users, both pedestrians and cyclists, you may need to make some of those adjustments.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I will be frank. I do not think we are going to be able to reach 88 seconds in every case.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): You are looking at where you can reduce it from where you are?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Yes.

Joe Irvin (Chief Executive, Living Streets): Where improvements are being made, it is very welcome. If somebody told you that you were going to have - I do not know what you would like - quiche or steak-and-chips four days a week but you have to eat wiggly grubs or something on the other day, you are not going to feel great about it. Therefore, it is great to do those things, but this is a really big prestige project. There are going to be many more people cycling, hopefully, as a result of that. We are hoping there are many more people walking as well, actually. Therefore, do not say that the standard today is perfect and cannot be improved upon. This is all about improvement, is it not?

I do accept that in some places we think the waiting times are too long at the moment and we are then saying they are going to be no worse or are even coming down slightly. The study that I know about, TfL's study on pedestrians, found that 85% pedestrians waited no longer than 30 seconds before they crossed the road, whether they were at a red light or not. This is a prestige project. This is not a hugely expensive part of it. It is worth getting right in all these places to make sure that this is fit for 10, 20 and 30 years ahead when we will have many more people cycling and many more people walking.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Thank you for that. I want to just move on to one other point before we move on to a different area. Rachel, can I pick up with you the issue of modelling? It was mentioned earlier. With TfL's modelling on this, we know it struggles with understanding bike movements and pedestrian movements as well. I cannot remember what we were told before. Was it a fifth of a car or a quarter of a car? Obviously, it does not make sense. What are your thoughts on the modelling and how accurate it is to predict both the possible congestion or not and also the disbenefits to different road users?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): TfL appreciates that there are issues related to modelling and cycling and the modelling has to come with a health warning. For that reason as well, I would have a lot of sympathy with Julian [Bell] when talking about the boroughs feeling it is quite onerous with the amount of modelling they have to do. Modelling is viewed often as an obstruction because you tend to get those big numbers like a 16-minute predicted delay for one particular journey. I do not think those numbers really should be viewed as what is likely to happen. They are viewed as a prediction under certain conditions, most of which are not likely to be met.

For example, the modelling assumes that no peak spreading will happen, which means that the trips that are currently made in the busiest peak hour by car will continue to be made at that busiest peak hour, whatever happens and whatever the changes in terms of journey times. We know that is not true. Peak spreading has continued to happen in London, particularly in central London, and it represents a more efficient use of the network. It is a good thing and people will, if they can, adjust their journeys. That will happen. You will not see those wait times happen in that way.

There are many other things that have been excluded from the modelling that would be expected to reduce wait times, for example rerouting by cyclists. TfL's modelling and most other modelling, too - it is not that TfL is actually at the forefront in many ways - cannot predict cyclist routing and so there is no attempt to say that cycles will no longer be on the busy motor routes that they currently take and will reroute to the Superhighways. That obviously frees up space. We know that there are delays at the moment related to bikes being on other routes and that will also reduce delays. There is a whole list of other things that have not been quantified and have not been included. Therefore, those figures have to be taken with a massive pinch of salt and not seen as barriers.

We need to look at the big picture. We need to move towards a healthier, more efficient, friendlier transport system that copes with the increasing population. It would be ridiculous if the fact that those numbers stopped us moving to a more efficient mode that is associated with less congestion and less delay. We know that we want people on bikes and not in cars and the modelling often ends up being an obstruction to that. What it should be seen as is indicating certain areas that you may need to look at and think about how you might use mitigation measures, but it should not be a barrier. It should be something that you keep an eye on.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Do you think that after this has been introduced and looking at the effect it has had on other roads, the modelling can then be adjusted to use the future schemes? Is that how you would like to see it go forward?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Very much so. I know that TfL is doing some work on the Cycle Superhighway 2 extension in that regard and it is really important that that work is done and that that work is made public and that we discuss the relationship between the modelling assumptions and what actually happens.

For example, in terms of the cost-benefit analysis as well - which is an appraisal as opposed to modelling and is quantifying benefits, adding them up and subtracting costs and so on - it is based on those predictions, whereas that most likely will not actually happen. When we do the cost-benefit analysis, we are going to be overestimating the costs and underestimating the benefits and that is also endemic at the moment. These tools do not work well and TfL recognises that and we need to not assume they are giving us correct answers.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Yes. A lot of transport modelling seems to need to be updated. We have had in the past London Overground with huge suppressed demand. This current modelling does not seem to predict how many passengers are likely to use different modes.

Michael Welbank MBE (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee, City of London Corporation): I was going to suggest my colleague, Iain Simmons. I am not a modeller. I am not a model, either, but there we are. Sorry, you were not meant to laugh at that!

Iain Simmons (Assistant Director City Transportation, City of London Corporation): Just to help you with your deliberations, I would share a lot of what Rachel [Aldred] says in the sense that there are certain

constraints around modelling. You can use it as a design tool. You can use the models to assess what the impacts are. That is fine if there are relatively modest changes, but with what is built into the models - the fixed-trip matrices and various things that Rachel said - the peaks cannot spread. They are very poor and crude tools. Therefore, they are by no means the be all and end all.

One of the things is that if there is less capacity for motor vehicles to move, wherever they may be, immediately adjacent to these routes or further away in London, it does presuppose that if they cannot all move when they are currently moving, there is some other time when they can. Certainly, the characteristic of a lot of central London is that the motor vehicle movement is the same right the way through the day from 7.00 in the morning until 7.00 in the evening. It just does not look like that because in the peak periods the motor vehicles are interacting with lots of pedestrians and lots of cyclists and it all slows down. However, actually, there is not a huge amount of capacity - certainly in my knowledge of the City of London - so that if vehicles do not move in a certain time period, they would be able to move at a different time period. As I say, there are nuances around this.

In terms of the broad impacts and one or two of the things that TfL did prior to the Olympics, there were some very good maps that were produced to indicate the effect of the Olympic Route Network and how and where certain parts of London would be disadvantaged and there would be greater journey times for that. That was absolutely fine.

However, they also did work and we know from our experience and monitoring in the City that, say, whilst the Olympics were on, if you were in central London or if you were in the City of London, you could move around more easily. That was only on the basis of 10% less traffic. The key bit is not to get too hung up on the core content of the modelling because there are so many variables in it that it will not paint the true picture of how people behave.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Andrew, do you want to comment on the modelling? Also, you have to respond to the consultation. You are supposed to be onsite in early 2015. Perhaps tell us what the schedule is to build this ground-breaking East-West Superhighway.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I agree with what both Iain [Simmons] and Rachel [Aldred] have said. The modelling has often been too pessimistic in the past and you can see that by what it predicted compared to what has actually happened.

It predicted, for instance, that the abolition of the Western Extension to the Congestion Charge Zone would cause between 8% and 12% more traffic in the Zone and a rise of 15% to 21% in congestion. The actual rise was 6%. It predicted a drop in traffic speeds of 6% to 12%. The actual drop was 3%. On one of the cycle schemes we have already done, the first fully segregated Superhighway stretch in Stratford High Street, it predicted delays of about a minute-and-a-half or a minute-and-a-quarter for bus services on that road. Actually, the delay has been negligible.

There are limitations. Firstly and most importantly, modelling does not make any kind of allowance for modal shift, which is of course the single most important objective of these schemes. We have already seen big modal shifts in the earlier cycle schemes and the earlier Superhighway schemes, even though they were not much more than paint on the road. This one, we hope, will generate even greater modal shift.

Secondly, as Rachel [Aldred] said, it does not make any kind of allowance for traffic spreading or evaporating, which we have seen in a number of cases where there is reduced road capacity such as the Blackwall Tunnel, for instance.

Thirdly, it assumes the general decline in traffic we have seen in London over the last ten years will not continue. I admit that it has actually stopped for the moment, but overall over the last ten years we have seen a pretty substantial decline in traffic in London generally, in central London particularly and on these routes especially.

Fourthly, it does not take account of all the mitigation measures we are putting in place, some of which Iain [Simmons] mentioned, which are things like better enforcement of parking and loading restrictions.

It has a couple of key limitations about buses as well. It does not capture the benefits that come from moving buses from bike lanes and bus stops and removing bikes from bus lanes as well. If you have ever been on a bus in a bus lane, you will know that the bus is often slowed down because cyclists are in the bus lane and it can only go at the pace of the cyclists, or it is often prevented from pulling away from a stop because there are cyclists passing. When buses and bikes are separated, as they have been at Stratford High Street, for instance, then that conflict is removed and buses can move away from stops more quickly because they do not have to wait for bikes and, also, they do not have to travel at the pace of bikes in the bus lanes. That is one of the reasons why the modelling for the Stratford High Street scheme was too pessimistic.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): There is learning from that going forward. Can you just comment on the timescale? When will this East-West Cycle Superhighway be fully open?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): We have just finished collating all the responses. As you said, there has been a very large number. There were 14,700 or so direct to TfL and a further 6,000 or so from the LCC. Of the 14,000 that came directly to us, 79% were in support and 5% were partially supportive and so a total of 84% support or partially support it. Including the 6,000 from the LCC, it goes up a bit, as you can imagine. It goes up to about 86% to 90% full or partial support. That is good. There is a lot of support from businesses, a huge amount of support from businesses --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): When is it going to be on-site? We know there is a lot of support. We have heard that, even from our guests today.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): What we are in the process of doing now is evaluating the responses and seeing what kinds of changes we can do in response to some of the complaints we have heard already this morning. That is where we are now. After that the Mayor will take a decision and after that we will get building, yes, I hope early next year.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Early next year or in the spring, shall we say, next year, you hope to start on-site. When should it be open, if it all goes to plan?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The plan is April 2016, but it is conditional on the Mayor's decision and on any changes we may make.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Of course. Great. Thank you.

Victoria Borwick AM: I would like to just go back to the consultation, please. Inevitably, there are concerns that have been touched on and it is important in this forum today that we want to make sure that everybody feels they have had their chance for a say. Particularly in areas like Westminster, there are residents who live in their communities and there is a slight concern that cyclists fly by, fly in, fly past and are being given priority over the residents who are living in their communities. It is quite important. We can talk about the figures and they seem rather overwhelming in the sense that you have said figures like 70%, 80% or 90% of people are in favour. I am absolutely sure that around this horseshoe we are all in favour, but the thing is that that does not mean that we have to disregard residents' concerns because they have to live there 365 days a year. We just want to raise in this public forum the point that residents' views should be considered and that they should not be given any lower priority view to those of the cyclists.

I really want to make sure that despite the main consultation being over, you will be working with residents' groups - you and TfL - to reassure them and you will make time to see them to see about those minor changes, some of which have been instanced this morning on turning and crossing. We all are particularly conscious on safety. There was another pedestrian killed yesterday, sadly, in Kensington and so we are very concerned about the safety aspects. I hope that we can ask that you take this time and that, as you say and as was said earlier by Joe [Irvin], a little bit more time spent now might mean a month or so of delay but in the end will come up with a scheme that people will more wholeheartedly support. I am not talking about in terms of the physical numbers but the actual people who live with what is going to be a significant change to London's streets.

My plea is, please, can I ask you to make time to meet those groups that do want to meet you and look at how those changes and tweaks which Caroline [Pidgeon AM, Chair] and others have identified can actually make this more widely understood?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Let me give you an example of what we are doing with residents. I know you have been particularly concerned about another scheme, Cycle Superhighway 5, which is going across Vauxhall Bridge and up through Pimlico and then in the other direction down Harleyford Road and to the Oval.

As I mentioned, we have had a huge amount of discussion with local residents about that on both sides of the river. On the south side they were worried that there was a track in front of their homes on Harleyford Road. As part of the consultation changes I mentioned, we moved the track to the other side where there are not as many homes. There is a block of flats but there is no parking with it. Also, we have reinstated a banned turn that they objected to. Therefore, we have met their concerns on two aspects that they were worried about on that side of the river.

On the other side, there is a group of residents on a couple of streets called the Ponsonbys that I have also met. I have met Simon Allison, the Chairman of the residents association there. TfL officials have had a lot of meetings with him as well. What they want is something to prevent a rat-running when the turn from Bessborough Gardens into Millbank is banned. Working with Westminster, we can give them that as well. It is ultimately Westminster City Council's call. It is their road, but they seem sympathetic. That is the kind of thing we are doing all along the route.

One of the advantages of the East-West route, however, is that there are relatively few residents on most of it. There are residents in Bayswater with whom we have been engaging very closely, in fact.

Victoria Borwick AM: That is another area I was going to raise. I do not want to go through every single one here this morning, but the point is that it has been raised by Caroline [Pidgeon AM, Chair] and others.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): We are very conscious of that and we have --

Victoria Borwick AM: Only by working with these groups on these minor tweaks, you can then say, "OK, you have done your bit", and we can all proceed with a bit more --

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Yes. We have done a huge amount of work with residents on that kind of basis.

Victoria Borwick AM: It is important that residents do feel they are valued. Thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): I feel quite reassured by that. Let's move on to Quietways.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you. Can I just say that I have been grateful for the work that TfL has done in talking to my residents and helping deal with some things like changes of turns? That has been very productive.

Before I come over to Andrew [Gilligan], can I ask our other guests whether they share my enthusiasm for the idea of Quietways? As a non-confident cyclist, if that is the word, I am very keen to see other women and other people who do not feel fit enough to get on their bikes and go. Quietways look like a positive solution to me. Is that something that you feel?

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): Certainly from my experience, I have been a daily cyclist in London for the last two-and-a-half years now and everybody says, "But are you not scared?" When you try to encourage other people to do it, they say, "I cannot. I just do not want to do it. I do cycle, but not on London roads". Therefore, we have to provide an environment where people will feel safer and where there is less traffic. As well as Quietways, we need to start doing things like car-free days at weekends like Paris has suggested and look to take the traffic away and get the cyclists feeling safe. Equally, London is a pretty stressful place and actually getting on your bike and going on a nice ride down the canal is the best way of de-stressing yourself and getting some quality of life. We need to make sure that we have more opportunities like that for people and get people loving cycling, which they will do if they have these Quietways.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): Julian, you had us on your 'hello' there really because we are all keen to see success on this. However, the point is that although there has obviously been a lot of profile to the Cycle Superhighways, in terms of getting non-traditional cyclists on the streets of London it seems to me that this is probably going to be a bigger win in some ways. Rachel, do you have a comment on it?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Yes. The principle of Quietways is brilliant. My concern, though, is the extent to which they are actually going to be quiet and the levels of motor traffic. There has been sometimes a little bit of slippage. Rather than these being really quiet, high-quality routes, they can go in the direction of, "OK, let us put some signs up in residential streets". We need to recognise that residential streets are often not that welcoming for new cyclists and less confident people at the moment due to rat-running.

Research supports this. I did a survey of people's attitudes to cycling with children. With modal filtering, which is where you cross off a street to through motor traffic but you can still access all properties, there is a really big jump with that compared to a residential street that has rat-running. It makes a big difference. People are not necessarily going to cycle with their kids if you have rat-running.

Similarly, TfL has done two surveys. One called the cycle route choice study showed that residential streets were hardly seen as preferable to other types of street, which was a big surprise to the researchers. They thought people would say, "Yes, I would much rather cycle on a residential street than on a main road or high street", and they did not. That indicates that residential streets in themselves are not necessarily good enough. Similarly, the cycling behaviour study that TfL did compared low-volume residential streets to streets with no traffic - that was the description - and the latter were rated much more highly.

The key thing about modal filtering is that it means you will not have that rat-running through motor traffic and you can still have accessing motor traffic. For me, the research suggests that is the really big difference. Therefore, I would want to see Quietways removing through motor traffic rather than just putting signs on existing residential rat-runs.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): We could see this done well or we could see this done badly. It is a question, again, of design. Chris, did you see this as a model for elsewhere in the country?

Chris Boardman MBE (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): I am a little bit confused as to what it is. I walk in London. I only ever walk in London. I walk everywhere. I do not get on the Tube. I walk through a lot of the streets and I have not found many quiet streets, by and large. There are parks and canals and they have traffic. I suppose I would have to give you a definition of what a Quietway is. For me, it would be where I would be OK with one of my older children [cycling] or something like that, but I am not finding those.

One point is that human beings are essentially lazy and, if you want them to shift, they will want to go the easiest, simplest, quickest route and that is what we have to focus on. I certainly love the idea of it --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): [Abraham] Maslow's [20th century American psychologist] hierarchy of needs would put you with safety first, though, would it not? If you were concerned for your safety, you would go the safer route first.

Chris Boardman MBE (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): Yes, but then what probably happens in fact and what we are seeing with our 2% of cyclists is that they are choosing not to do it at all. If it takes me all the way around to have to find quiet streets. It is too difficult and I --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): Joe?

Joe Irvin (Chief Executive, Living Streets): I am a cyclist as well and, if I am in a hurry, I will go on the main street, but it is risky. I am sure, like every other cyclist here, I have had some near misses. If I have more time, I would certainly go down a Quietway. However, still, you have to balance that out. Do it right so that it is good for pedestrians and for cyclists. A good example of that, I would say, is what they are doing in Hackney. They have The Narrows at the top of Mare Street. It actually makes a good cut-through that you could not really do before. If you wanted something that would make more places better for cyclists who are

not going at high speeds and who might even get overtaken on the Superhighways and might feel they are too fast for them, a more general 20-mile-an-hour limit for cars would be a much more important thing.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): For speed control, OK.

Michael Welbank MBE (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee, City of London Corporation): In the City, of course, we have a problem that we have inherited with a medieval street pattern; and the idea that one could find parallel to the traffic streets, something equally direct in a grid system of some sort, which are low-traffic streets; we have tried to find them but we are finding great difficulty. We support the idea but we cannot do it terribly well because of what we have inherited.

However, of course, one of the things we are doing is allowing two-way cycling on our one-way streets. That has been progressing with nearly all of our one-way streets now. I am not quite sure of the number we have but we are going through the whole lot, which is a surrogate way of having quiet streets.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): Yes. Very good. Andrew, do you want to tell us and explain the concept a bit more? What does it offer to Chris [Boardman]? Say something about what the timescales are for delivery.

The other point here is that when the Cycle Superhighways went in, there were lots of people who were critical of them. I heard you say they were no more than just blue paint on the road. Actually, a lot of people said that. How do we know that the Quietways we are going to get are not going to have to be retrofitted? How do we know that we are getting it right this time around?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Quietways are direct routes on low-traffic back streets through parks, canal towpaths and that kind of thing. They are a little bit like the old London Cycle Network, only done properly, as it were. They are the same kinds of routes as that, but they are done better. The London Cycle Network had a couple of key problems. Firstly, it was not always sufficiently direct. It took you around the houses. It sometimes took you up hills. It took you to places where people would not go. Secondly, it tended to give up at the difficult places.

Quietways will not do either of those things. If a Quietway has to join a main road for a time for the sake of directness, it will do so but it will do so with segregation or some other form of provision. If it has to go through a difficult junction, as some of them do, the junction or the area will be upgraded to make it easier for cyclists to get through. That, I suppose, is the difference. There is a different level of ambition.

We are just about to start construction on the first two. They will open in May. The first one will run from Waterloo to Greenwich and the second from Bloomsbury to Hackney and then extended later to Walthamstow. They will both run, you will see, on very good routes, some of which are existing cycleways but which have interventions to make them better. The Waterloo to Greenwich one, for instance, is going to include a new stretch of cycle-only path behind the football stadium at Millwall, which will close a major gap in that route that currently requires you to go on main roads. It will also have a number of other improvements. Things like chicanes and so on are going to be removed along the route and the whole thing is going to be direct and is going to flow as a route. It will be rather attractive and well-used route. It runs, if you know it, just north of the A2, more or less. It is like a parallel route to the Old Kent Road and it is a really pleasant cycle route that you will really enjoy.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): That is the one we have the press release from TfL on this morning.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Yes. That was mentioned in the press release this morning. There are seven in the first phase, which will be finished by 2016. There is another one from the City to Hainault, another one from Waterloo to Crystal Palace, another one from Central London to Wimbledon, Clapham Common to Croydon --

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): Roughly when will they be completed, Andrew?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): All of those are by 2016. Then we have another couple of dozen or so that we hope will be either finished or in progress by 2016 as well. We are just agreeing them with the boroughs.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): In May 2016, how many Quietways do you think we will have by then?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Seven, possibly more, depending how quickly the boroughs go. Nearly all Quietway routes on side streets are borough roads and anything involving the boroughs adds, obviously, a layer of decision-making to the process. That is why, for instance, we have managed to get designs for the Superhighways out even though they are quite complicated designs, but so far there have not been very many designs for Quietways. That is just because there are more people involved. Obviously, a typical Quietway would cross three or four boroughs and then they have to be joined up with each other and with TfL. That process is working quite well now.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): I will come to Julian [Bell] on that in a moment, if I may. I do not like to bring a critical note in, but I am a bit concerned about this. It seems apparent that the acceleration of the Quietways programme - and I am quoting from a letter from you, Andrew [Gilligan] and from Ben Plowden [Director of Strategy and Planning, Surface Transport, TfL], who I can see sitting in the audience - has led to pressures on other parts of the cycling portfolio, especially the Cycle to School Partnership programme. Actually, those other programmes are also incredibly important in giving people the infrastructure, particularly for children also. We ought to be giving them the skills and the confidence to use them as well.

Why are we seeing this robbing Peter to pay Paul, when actually what we want is to roll out cycling opportunities for the whole of London? I am not sure there is a rationale for why you would squeeze some successful localised programmes. I have local parents lobbying me on one right now in Dulwich. They are really upset about this. They also would be delivering a local cycle facility, accessible for children, etc. What is that about? I thought we were having big underspends on the cycling programme and so why are we squeezing this one?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The Cycle to School Partnership programme was a pilot programme. It is described in the Vision for Cycling as a pilot programme. It does not exist now. Essentially, we had 11 or so bids from boroughs. I may be wrong about that. It may be slightly more. We were going to do a pilot number of schemes; that is, one or two. However, we never were going to do more than that number. It is explicitly described as a pilot programme.

There is quite a lot of overlap as well with the Quietways programme. A lot of what the Dulwich applicants wanted is going to be delivered anyway through the Quietways programme. That is basically why we have turned down the Dulwich bid.

I was worried as well, to be absolutely honest with you, about some of the bids. From memory, the Southwark bid - which included Dulwich but was not confined to it - was aimed at getting an extra 240 children a day cycling to school at a cost of £2 million, plus the feasibility study - money they have already had - was £2.4 million. That is £10,000 per cyclist and I did not think that was value for money, I am afraid.

Also, I was worried that an awful lot of the people they were wanting to get to cycling were in fact already walking to school. I am not going to subsidise people to move from one active mode of transport to another. The purpose of this programme was to remove the school run or reduce the school run.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): In fact, that does not come across in the correspondence. What comes across is that you have to move money from one programme to another. Therefore, that is a different reply. I do not want to get too much into a local one, but I thought there was a principal point there about the importance of the local --

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Yes. I am quite keen to get some of these schemes delivered, but we will deliver them through the Quietway programme more than through that specific programme, which only ever was a pilot.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): OK. Julian, do you want to say something about the way TfL has been working with the boroughs to deliver these Quietway programmes? Do you see it as leading to success? Is it going to work?

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): The first thing to say is that actually 31 of the boroughs are working with TfL to deliver these Quietways. I am not sure which one is the one that is not.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It is Westminster because Westminster does not have any Quietways in it. It is in central London and it is in something called the Central London Grid.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): There you go. There is the mystery solved.

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): By definition, it cannot be a Quietway. Obviously, this is a programme that is going to go over ten years. I would say in response to Andrew [Gilligan] saying that this is another layer of decision-making that actually this is localism and it is right that these Quietways are delivered by the boroughs because they have that local knowledge. In Ealing, we have nine Quietways proposed. Three or four of them cross over boroughs, but we are always very engaged with our neighbours in order to work together. There has to be a pooling of skilled officers to deliver this. We do need to think about how groups of boroughs can perhaps share the capacity of their technical experts who are going to deliver those for us. We are doing those kinds of things. Again, because of the local knowledge that boroughs have, we will propose some amendments, but that is all to the good and will ensure that we get the best possible scheme and we get it right. That is the key thing.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): They will get a better fine grain of the scheme at a local level. Do you think the outer London boroughs are getting a fair crack of the whip from TfL's cycling programmes overall, including the Quietways?

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): We would probably jump to mini-Hollands because it is the outer London boroughs.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We are coming on to that in a minute.

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): For those boroughs that are committed to investing in cycling - and you have talked about underspends - and in Ealing as a borough, we are very keen and we will have any money you can give us and we want more. However, we will use our own as well in order to try to do things and make things happen. For example, we have a Dutch-style roundabout at the bottom of Horn Lane and Acton High Street, which we have incorporated into the redesign of that junction. It was originally a traffic-light junction and it is now a traffic island, but we have included cycle-friendly design in that and used the existing budgets that were there to do it. We are all being squeezed financially and so it is about will as much as it is about the amount of money.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Just to add on the Quietways programme, the Quietways programme includes some money for big-ticket interventions in outer boroughs which were not successful in their mini-Holland bids. That is particularly in places like town centres that are barriers to Quietway-type cycling at the moment.

One of the big-ticket interventions is at Ealing and we are going to fund the Ealing Town Centre elements of Ealing's mini-Holland bid out of the Quietways programme. That is because you cannot do effective Quietway routes in that borough without tackling Ealing Town Centre. Basically, all roads lead to Ealing in that part of the world. There are seven or eight other of that sort of programme that we were also mentioning today.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): That was very helpful. Can I just ask a last question on the Quietways? We were talking about conflict with pedestrians. Are there any issues that need special management about conflict with pedestrians? One of the things that struck me is in the more residential areas where we are less likely to get signalised crossings and more likely to have pedestrian islands, zebra crossings, etc. Are we likely to see problems for older members of the community trying to cross the Quietway routes?

Joe Irvin (Chief Executive, Living Streets): I would say that it is all about the design and the context, really, and about the quantity of people doing that. I would kind of agree with the localism part of that because you are more likely to get that detail right if you have the local representative deciding it and, most important, if you actually consult local people about it - we do community street audits, for example - so that you do the things that they will really value. They are a very good idea. I mentioned the example of Hackney and Mare Street where there has been a really good example of trying to meld together an area for cyclists and for people walking. There could potentially be problems, but they are all solvable.

One particular area that was mentioned before is along canal routes. There are potential problems because it is a very limited space and sometimes you have people fishing there, which they are entitled to do. We should be respectful of all the users of those spaces.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): Chris, has Andrew [Gilligan] sold you Quietways?

Chris Boardman MBE (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): I am just arguing semantics over what they are called. For me, it is cycling infrastructure that all links up and some of them are highways - as the roads do - and some of them are small roads. It is about linking everything together and making it easier.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): Making a route.

Chris Boardman MBE (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): What we talk about a lot when we talk about conflict - and I have this conversation around the country - is people say, "There are cyclists on the pavement", but actually it is an inanimate object. We are talking about behaviour and behaviour is what we need to address and how we treat each other. I would hazard a guess that whatever mode of transport people are using, there will be the same amount of inconsiderate people and idiots and people who are friendly and considerate. We need to perhaps make the point that everybody is people and it is the behaviour we need to address and how we interact.

For example, I am a great proponent of bike bells. They are simple devices that are non-offensive to let people know that you are there. Even walking around London, I am crossing the road and I often miss cyclists and I just jump. Bells are something you could bring back. It is a small point, but I find that certainly on the quieter routes it really reduces tension.

Often - and statistics support the fact - it is not safety that is such a small concern. It is a label that we stick on things, but it is not. It is about being polite and about respect. Just letting people know you are there in advance makes a big difference.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Just to pick up on that, it is worth noting that some of the pedestrian-cyclist conflicts that we have stem from poor design and the fact that we have had a big increase in cycling relatively but we do not have the infrastructure to cater for that. One of the things that people get upset about - understandably - is cycling on pavements. If you look at where that happens, it is often where there is a big hostile road that people are frightened of cycling on.

There is research coming out of the United States, where, like us, they are starting from a low base and are trying to improve things. That shows that where you put in good infrastructure, you get less cycling on the pavement. It is not rocket science, but they have shown that it is true. That is a big benefit for pedestrians, potentially.

Also, one of the disadvantages of the current situation is that often on busy roads as well you have cyclists acting unpredictably from a pedestrian perspective and weaving in and out. If you have, as with the Superhighways, people in a predictable place, it can also be a benefit. Obviously, there are design issues and people need to be involved, but potentially there are quite a lot of gains.

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): Absolutely. That is excellent. Thank you.

Darren Johnson AM: This is just a quick one for Chris. On the Quietways, you say that people generally want to take the most direct and quickest route, but is that always the case? I certainly find in London there are a lot of people who are prepared to sacrifice journey time for a more pleasant experience going through a park or whatever. Is it really about getting the balance right on both so that there is a genuine choice between

the most direct routes on the Cycle Superhighways and the network of quieter, safer routes that complement them and give people a genuine choice?

Chris Boardman MBE (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling):

Absolutely. I will – and I did this morning – extend my journey so that I could come along the riverside. I agree. However, I will only go so far and --

Darren Johnson AM: Yes, and Andrew [Gilligan] was right to pick up on some of the problems that were wrong with the previous London Cycle Network and how it did take you well out of the way.

Chris Boardman MBE (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): In one of the surveys, Andrew [Gilligan], you identified over 20 different types of cyclist. There is not just a cyclist and a motorist. There are over 20 different types and so people are doing very different things. The biggest impact we could have in London is to get to people's journeys to and from work. Those are the ones that we would like to have the biggest impact on. When people are going to work, they will allow only so much extra time to take a quieter route and I certainly would, but in an hour only five minutes.

Darren Johnson AM: Within reason, yes. Thanks.

Chris Boardman MBE (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): The introduction, by the way, of one-way streets is something that has really happened here in London or rather two-way for cyclists. I am not seeing that anywhere else in the country. My own area has asked about it and had a real problem with it in terms of safety. They were just ignorant of the fact that it was being done in another part of the country really well. I would like to see that disseminated because it is another one of those ways to make it easier.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): It is the contraflows. I know cyclists often went the wrong way down the one-way street and actually to introduce it properly --

Chris Boardman MBE (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): They went the wrong way anyway.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Michael, you wanted to comment on that?

Michael Welbank MBE (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee, City of London

Corporation): From when we introduced it, there have been no accidents on any of the streets on which we have introduced this at all.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Yes. That is fantastic. We are going to move on to mini-Hollands now.

Richard Tracey AM: We have already had some mention of mini-Hollands when talking about Quietways, but we can deal now specifically with the progress of the mini-Hollands and indeed both the three winners and the others who were runners-up. I think it was last February, Andrew [Gilligan], when you announced all this.

There seems from the reports we have been receiving to have been quite a bit of criticism from particularly initially the areas that were the winners. I gather that Members of Parliament (MPs) in the areas, such as the MP for Walthamstow, have written an open letter to the council saying that it did not provide enough information before the trials went into place. In Enfield, the MP for Enfield South has called a public meeting

to discuss the Enfield proposals on the basis that there was not adequate consultation with local businesses. In Kingston is probably the most publicised and famous of all the mini-Holland schemes, the one with the decking along the riverbank, but now Kingston seems to have been a bit short on the money available to pay for it all.

Perhaps I can start with this financial element, Andrew. Is there money available that you from the Mayor's Office and TfL are willing to provide to councils that suddenly find the schemes they were proposing and won in the competition are a bit short on funding?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Nobody has been paid anything much yet. They have been paid amounts to design up proposals. However, the commitment is just under £30 million for each borough and that has not changed. The proposals probably will change slightly, I should think, in the light of public consultation, but they are not changing for any lack of money. In Kingston, for instance, as far as I know, they are still proceeding with all the things we agreed to fund in the bid.

What happens is that it is very much in the hands of the councils concerned to deliver and they are doing that in different ways. As you know, the schemes are of a different nature as well. Waltham Forest is less infrastructure-heavy and the idea is to 'Hackney-fy' it a bit. They have that network of Victorian streets in Leyton and Walthamstow and they want to introduce more filtered permeability of the sort we were talking about earlier and make them more cycle and pedestrian-friendly. They are also proposing a Superhighway on Lea Bridge Road. Those two proposals are going ahead full steam, as far as I understand.

In Kingston, they are remodelling the town centre and they are doing routes to and from it. Again, those proposals are happening. In Enfield, they have some indicative proposals in their bid and they are going to consult in the New Year on the detailed proposals they are actually planning.

Richard Tracey AM: That will be almost a year from when this was all first announced. As I recollect, you held a great press conference on the ninth floor [of City Hall] in February last year. Quite a few of us were there. It is going a bit slowly, is it not?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I do not think it is, no. How long has it been since we announced the programme as a whole? The Superhighway programme, for instance, was announced more than a year ago and it has taken us this long to come up with designs and so on, which are now ready to build or ready to build subject to the outcomes of the consultation. That is just how long it takes. It is not all that long, really, a year, is it?

Richard Tracey AM: Just on this point, in Kingston, for example, from what we are told, you have actually agreed or have certainly discussed and more or less agreed to provide £34 million. You talked about £30 million just a moment ago, but £34 million. They are saying that they have costed their scheme out at £41 million and so there is a £7 million shortfall. Is it likely to need to be pruned; the scheme I mean, rather than the funding? Are they going to need to prune it or indeed to completely scrap various parts of it? That seems to me the reality of the situation.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Their original scheme was costed at much more than we awarded them and we said that we were not prepared to fund certain elements in the original proposed scheme such as a bridge across the river alongside the railway bridge.

Richard Tracey AM: An actual bridge as distinct from the decking?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Yes, as distinct from the decking. One of the proposals was a bridge alongside the railway bridge that runs from Kingston to Hampton Wick. I said I did not think that was necessary. There was already a road bridge right next to it with a cycle lane on it.

Richard Tracey AM: Yes, indeed.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): That is why that has come down from the figure you have cited, but there was never any intention to fund that. We said to them right from the beginning, "We will not fund all the elements in your bid. We will fund £34 million worth", and that is what they are getting.

Richard Tracey AM: I see.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): They have to design it and it has to come to us and be accepted by us before we will release the money for anything. That is only as you would expect. I certainly am not going to write a cheque for £34 million on day one. They have to go through a process of designing and consulting and that is what they are all doing. That is a process which has to take time. It cannot be done overnight and a year is a reasonable time to do it.

Richard Tracey AM: On that point of the timing and all the various discussions that go on, as I understand it, none of the runners-up - and you are well aware that Merton, one of my boroughs, is one of those runners-up - have received any notification of what they are actually going to get. We have discussed this in one of these meetings before --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We did.

Richard Tracey AM: -- and as I think we all understood, you were saying they were going to know the next week. However, still we are hearing that these various runners-up, in addition to the three winners, still have no idea what they will actually get from you and TfL in the end. Is that right?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): As I said, the week after I appeared here last, we did write to all of the boroughs. Julian [Bell] can confirm that. We wrote to Julian and we said, "We are going to give you Ealing town centre". We wrote to Richmond and said, "We are going to give you Twickenham and the A316". Who else was there? We wrote to Redbridge where there is a crossing of the A406. We have written to those boroughs.

Richard Tracey AM: That does not actually accord with what we are hearing, you see. I can speak --

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I am surprised about that because we have written to them.

Richard Tracey AM: Bexley, we are told, is still in some sort of fog about what they are getting. In Merton, certainly, despite a number of questions that I have asked and local councillors have asked of the council officers and of the Cabinet Member, still there is no actual statement of precisely what they are going to get.

Steve O'Connell AM: That goes for Croydon as well, if I may add my two penn'orth.

Richard Tracey AM: There we are. Croydon, too, you see, and so --

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Croydon was not --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We were told that the letters went to the boroughs, actually.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): All the letters were sent to boroughs at the end of October. They have all had letters saying, "We want to fund this, this and this". Julian [Bell] mentioned nine Quietway routes in his letter. His letter also mentions that we are going to fund Ealing town centre. Richmond's letter, similarly, says that. They have all had letters. Actually, the Committee has asked for the letters and I believe we have sent you them, have we not?

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): It does not give a sum. That is the issue. They have been written and were given examples, but they have not been given a precise sum.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I am pretty sure we have given you each of the letters we sent to the boroughs. Is that not right?

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Yes, but they do not have in them the precise sum, which is what Richard is getting at. That is exactly what you are getting at, yes.

Richard Tracey AM: That is what they are saying, some general statement of intent. After all, you gave them last February a statement of intent when you said, "These are runners-up".

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Perhaps outside, Andrew [Gilligan].

Richard Tracey AM: Julian, were you about to say something?

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): I can only comment from Ealing's perspective, but Andrew [Gilligan] is absolutely right. We received the letter but, more than that, we have received some money. We have received £150,000 in order to develop our proposals in Ealing Town Centre further and that, again, is the process we were told would happen so that we can do the base modelling and the surveys. We are looking to have completed that by Christmas. The detailed design work will then take place in early 2015 with the aim to roll out the new measures in the summer of 2015. We are getting on with it and we have the letter and the money.

Richard Tracey AM: Perhaps you can ask your colleagues on the London TEC how they feel and whether they have all been getting quite such good treatment as you obviously are.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): They have all been treated the same, actually.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Richard, can I suggest that we would like is a letter from TfL with very clearly for each borough what is being allocated and what has already been given to them to spend on what so that we are very clear? We know there is an intention and we would like in writing what money is going to each borough. Yes?

Richard Tracey AM: Yes. Well said, Caroline. I quite agree.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I will say this as well, though, Richard. If there is any sense from the boroughs that they are not getting the money quickly enough, I would be extremely concerned about that. I have been very firmly on TfL's case to get the boroughs this money and to get commitments made to boroughs. As far as I know, that has in fact happened. If it has not, I want to know about it.

Richard Tracey AM: Thank you. Ben Plowden is sitting behind you and noting all of that. He is in a position to take some action on behalf of TfL.

The other thing that we are concerned about is this local opposition. As I mentioned, there is one MP in Walthamstow and another one in Enfield complaining about aspects of the creation of these mini-Hollands. Perhaps I could ask you, Rachel, this one. Is there a real chance that some of these schemes may absolutely founder as a result of local opposition or certainly be radically changed?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Obviously, changes may be made in relation to what local residents think. That is absolutely right and proper. I would say, though, that these schemes are really exciting and radical in the context of outer London. If you look at the cycling rates in outer London, they are far below inner London and the rise in cycling has been in inner London. This is really transformational.

Richard Tracey AM: Yes, indeed.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Obviously, it is a difficult thing to do and in Waltham Forest, as far as I know, the approach has involved trialling, which is a good thing. From the statistics I have seen that they provided, people generally became more favourable towards the scheme when it was trialled, as well as suggesting useful changes and so on. That seems to me to have been a positive process. The detail of the schemes can be changed and new ideas can be brought into them, but the whole thrust of it really seems to me very interesting. You often have segregated routes introduced on main roads, which is really important, but at the same time - say in Waltham Forest - you have the modal filtering. Enfield would like to do the same and remove the through motor traffic from residential streets. It is really exciting and, yes, I hope they do go ahead substantially as planned, obviously with changes in response to consultation.

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): I can confirm, Chair, that the political leadership in Waltham Forest and the Lead Member, Councillor Clyde Loakes, is determined to make this happen. It does require political leadership to deliver these changes because there is a bit of pain, but that is recognised in Waltham Forest. There is a determination to make a radical change that is going to benefit everybody but will have some elements of difficulty.

Richard Tracey AM: Political leadership or not, there is a problem, I would have thought, with consultation if local businesses and of course in some cases perhaps opposition members are not quite exactly on the same track as the majority party. All of that sort of thing surely can cause some problems and the scheme could founder as a result, could it not? You do not think so?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Could I say something on the businesses? It is well established that local businesses often overestimate the amount of shopping that is done by customers coming by car and that is the case in this country, it is the case in the Netherlands, it is the case everywhere.

Richard Tracey AM: New York.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Yes, exactly and local businesses may overestimate the impact on them but will underestimate the impact of customers walking and cycling to the shops. When measures are trialled, then I hope that people will see that what they feared does not happen and that actually most people come to the shops already by sustainable modes often and that will be increased and a more pleasant environment will be created.

Richard Tracey AM: Chris, perhaps I could ask you. You have been speaking very enthusiastically about the whole process and the progress of cycling. Does it worry you slightly to hear all these problems in the outer London boroughs? You obviously know very well what is happening in the centre and you watch that, but the outer London boroughs have been up to now rather behind on the cycling revolution. What do you feel?

Chris Boardman (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Adviser, British Cycling): There are two things, really. I have been from a ministerial level all the way down to local cycling officer and have come all the way back around; it has been an interesting journey. Be it London, be it the outer boroughs, be it the rest of the country, it is a very similar pattern, which probably does not surprise you, where there is genuine leadership and somebody who has the courage to actually stand up for something that is right and that they know and believe that will work. We are surrounded by evidence 250 miles from here in Germany. They have to push through and there is pain because we are talking about a culture change. Culture change is always slow and it is always painful; those two things. However, where it is working - in Bristol, in London - is when you have leadership that says, "This is good for everybody. We are going to do it and we are going to get some complaints, but we will push through". That has to be there or it is not going to happen.

One of the things that has come up and was mentioned a few times is consultation. One of the things that I have noticed is there is a disproportionately large amount of weight given to the vocal minority and I have found that a lot. If somebody makes a noise, be it on a corporate level, as we have seen recently in London, or be it an individual in a local area, a lot of things can change and not enough weight is being given to the majority of people who think it is OK.

The second aspect of consultation is we do not tell people the upsides of what this will mean. We do not emphasise what has happened in other areas for local shops and businesses and retail sales in New York, which are probably more similar to ours than across the channel in mainland Europe. They saw that their business was improved everywhere the cycling lanes were by about a quarter, but that information is not getting across in consultation. We have a natural fear of change and people just do not want to change.

One of the elements - and I am aware I am going slightly off topic - and one of the ways they dealt with it - and you have also mentioned in New York - is they had a try-before-you-buy scheme. "We want to do this. We want to remove all of this park and put in bike lanes". The local businesses did not like it and they said, "We are going to put it in for six months. If you do not like we will take it out". Then they said, "OK, we will try it". It worked and then it moved from there. There is definitely something in that part of it. Perhaps the courageous part of it has to be to get to the point of trial rather than yes or no from the outset.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): That is what they were doing in Waltham Forest, to be fair. They tried it for a couple of weeks and they are going to do some more trials later on. All schemes in practice have benefits and disbenefits and if the rule becomes that we cannot do anything that causes a disbenefit of any kind, then we can never do anything.

Richard Tracey AM: Yes. You mentioned there Waltham Forest. There has been a spate of collisions in Lea Bridge Road. Is there likely to be any acceleration of the process to try and deal with that or not?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The Superhighway on Lea Bridge Road is one of the earlier projects that Waltham Forest wants to deliver and I am very keen that they do that. As you know and as you have mentioned, there have been three now. It is a busy road. The amount of cycling in that area is going up enormously, more even than the rest of London because of demographic change partly. More young, middle-class people are moving out from places like Hackney and they are just not catered for at the moment on the roads of the area and that is one of the key reasons why we gave them the money.

Richard Tracey AM: The whole process of consultation we talked about with Quietways and all the rest of it. Have you learned any lessons from the consultation which you may apply and change the process in the future?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I am very keen on trials actually. I am very keen. It is not the TfL way. They are less keen.

Richard Tracey AM: What, less keen to consult?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Less keen to trial. I am very keen on trials and it has been proven in other cities and other countries to be a useful way of overcoming people's understandable qualms about new and changed schemes. Waltham Forest is doing that in the mini-Hollands and I am encouraging some of the other mini-Hollands to do it as well and I want some of the boroughs to do it with the borough schemes.

Richard Tracey AM: Yes. Finally, one to you, Julian. Do you think that boroughs have sufficient capacity to deliver these sorts of schemes on your own or not? How do you feel about the way it tests your resources and your officers?

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): I have alluded to the challenges that we are facing. Boroughs are experiencing unprecedented levels of cuts and it is an immense challenge financially for councils at the moment. We have been having discussions and working with TfL to actually look at ways in which we can pool some of those officers with the technical capabilities to deliver the mini-Hollands and the other cycling infrastructure projects that we are working on. That is something that we are doing because we recognise it is a problem and it is a challenge. Again, it is potentially a saving for councils if there are groups of boroughs like in Ealing - we are in the West London Alliance - and if we can find a way of sharing our officers because they do not always have a project which their expertise can deliver operating at a particular time. Yes, we will buy in some expertise as well, but we have officers and perhaps there are ways we can pool them.

Richard Tracey AM: OK, thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon AM (Chair): Lovely. Thank you very much for that. Let us move on to looking at the Central London Grid.

Tom Copley AM: Andrew, is the current timetable for delivering the Central London Grid achievable and what are the key milestones in terms of its delivery?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The plan is to have 50% of it delivered by 2016 - or by the end of 2016 in this case - and the answer depends, as with the Quietways, on the boroughs. I am reasonably hopeful. I am starting now to see some quite good designs from many of the boroughs. I would like to see a few more. That is the answer.

Tom Copley AM: Are the boroughs working effectively together or do you foresee problems between them in terms of delivering it?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The Central London Grid Board, which has representatives of all the Zone 1 boroughs on it and TfL, brings them together. I am also engaging with the boroughs. Each of the boroughs I have been around to and I am asking them to come forward with designs. I have seen Westminster has now come forward with its designs and I am going through them at the moment. I have seen some designs from Camden and Islington. I have seen some from Southwark and I just need to see more designs, essentially. I want the process to speed up a bit. That is the answer.

Tom Copley AM: Julian, from London Councils' point of view, what role are you playing in terms of the delivery and co-ordination of this?

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): It is something that we discuss at TEC and, yes, we are obviously keen to make sure that we do push ahead and deliver it by the 2016 target. At London Councils, we will continue to offer support to the boroughs and work to deliver it.

Tom Copley AM: Andrew, before I bring in the City, you said 50% by the end of 2016. Do you have a target for full completion?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The programme runs to 2019. It really is in the hands of the boroughs and I cannot emphasise that enough. The Central London Grid is the programme I am most worried about, if you want my honest advice. I do not think it is going fast enough at the moment.

Tom Copley AM: All right, but this is something that is down to the boroughs, not TfL?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): There is a series of more complex interactions with the boroughs on this because, even though they are quiet roads, they are quiet only in relative terms, relative to the other roads around them and there are still quite complex interactions with the TfL road network and so on. However, I am concerned about the progress on the Central London Grid and I want it to go faster.

Tom Copley AM: OK. Michael, what is your view in terms of the delivery of this according to the timetable that Andrew has set out?

Iain Simmons (Assistant Director City Transportation, City of London Corporation): I know you have asked the question for Michael, but perhaps I can help you with that. I sit on this programme board with Andrew [Gilligan]. I am wearing one of the other hats that I wear, if I am not being paid by the City of London, as a chairman of a technical advisers group and I helped to put something together. Firstly, the group is very healthy. I do not quite share Andrew's concern about the network and the delivery. One of the things that helped Andrew to understand how groups of authorities - and it is not just boroughs because it is The Royal Parks and the Canal and River Trust - can get together, can share objectives and can set out to do things.

One of the key things within that forum is that the authorities have agreed a network of routes that will be delivered by 2016. That needed to happen before TfL released the money and so it is kind of a catch-22; you cannot start until you know what the programme is. I suspect, on one of the questions asked earlier about Quietways, that that in a sense is the same process. You have to demonstrate various things and probably central London is slightly better resourced in terms of individuals, but many authorities - including my own - had to take people on and you are not going to take people on until you know you are getting the money. There were some links there.

Then finally there is the other aspect which is TfL's other role as traffic regulator. As Andrew [Gilligan] said, for much of what happens in central London and probably quite a lot of what happens within outer London, if it involves traffic signals, if it involves the TfL road network or if it involves one of the strategic roads, there is a formal process to go back through TfL and demonstrate what the project is and what the impacts are. There are gateways to get through and that almost inevitably takes a little more time. However, sitting on that board, I am not overly concerned at this point in time.

Tom Copley AM: You are more optimistic than Andrew?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Let me say this. The programmes for which TfL is directly responsible are proceeding well. We have seen extremely complicated designs for things like the East-West and North-South Superhighways, which are far more difficult and complicated than Central London Grid routes delivered by now. We have finished consultation on most of those schemes. We have big designs for junctions. These are much, much simpler routes and there is yet to be any public consultation on any Central London Grid design.

Tom Copley AM: OK. Iain [Simmons] mentioned the Royal Parks. How are negotiations progressing with the Royal Parks in terms of bringing them into this?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): On the grid?

Tom Copley AM: On the grid.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): We have agreed some grid routes for the Royal Parks and actually they are relatively simple to deliver because they will not require very many alterations. As part of the discussions we have had with them, one of the things they are interested in doing is making sure that the conflict between pedestrians and cyclists on those routes is minimised and that we think of new ways of signalling that those grid routes and the Quietway-type routes in the parks are for, if you like, non-commuter cyclists, less fast and aggressive cyclists. Therefore, we are setting up a reference group to help draw those sort of things up.

Tom Copley AM: What about things like access at night?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): As you know, some of the parks are open all night. Richmond Park and Bushy Park are open all night to cyclists. In central London, Hyde Park is closed at midnight and reopens at 5.00am. I have asked them to have a look at that but I do not think there is going to be any change in that, to be honest.

Tom Copley AM: Will this simply mean that these bits of the grid will not operate at certain times?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): In much the same way that the Tube does not operate at night, at least at the moment. There are going to be gaps in the grid when Hyde Park is closed. I have asked the Royal Parks, but ultimately it is their park. If they do not want to open it up, I cannot make them.

Tom Copley AM: Does the Mayor not appoint people to the Royal Parks?

Caroline Pidgeon AM (Chair): I think so, yes.

Tom Copley AM: Yes. Anyway, OK. I wanted to bring in Rachel and Chris [Boardman] about the needs of cyclists being met and the balance between new cyclists and what the Mayor would call the 'lycra-clad brigade' or they want to 'de-lycrafy'. What is your view on the balance here?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Yes, it is absolutely right that we need to plan for people who currently do not cycle because, after all, we are after a transformation. We are after cycling going for something that is still currently just a small minority to something that is seen as a normal everyday mode of transport.

Also, the research evidence suggests that - and maybe we will talk about this in a minute - there are differences in strength of preference. People, cyclists, non-cyclists, a range of users, all want to be away from heavy, fast motor traffic. It is not that surprising, perhaps. If you build for the people who do not currently cycle and if you do it well you will also deal well with people who currently cycle, who if you ask them actually do not really like cycling on the Embankment maybe or whatever road it is but do not have any alternative currently. If you build facilities that have space for them to overtake the slower cyclists, it will work well for everyone.

Chris Boardman (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Adviser, British Cycling): At the moment it is also a self-selecting group in that this is the environment and so the people who are doing it now have already steered themselves that they are going to do it in this environment. You have your lycra-clad, quite brave individuals going out there and doing it and mixing with the traffic. I know it sounds ridiculous, but they are not the people who this is for. This is for people like us around this table who just want to ride steadily from A to B and that will only happen when there is space to do that.

Tom Copley AM: Do you think it is catering for a different market, as it were?

Chris Boardman (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Adviser, British Cycling): Predominantly, and the market that is there now and the people who are there now will use it and benefit from it, but they have already made their choice. They have already rolled their sleeves up - their high-vis sleeves - and will get out there and do it. It is the normal people whom we want to encourage and that will only happen when we create space for them to do that.

Tom Copley AM: OK. Thank you.

Caroline Pidgeon AM (Chair): Lovely. Thank you. Let us move on to better junctions.

Darren Johnson AM: Yes, thank you. If we can start with Rachel, are you confident that TfL now has a good grip of safe junction design for both cyclists and pedestrians in the other plans coming forward on the Better Junctions Review?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): One thing that does still concern me is the extent to which safer junctions for pedestrians and cyclists are still threatened by motor capacity throughputs. I am still waiting to see what happens in terms of some of the junctions that are coming through. Junctions are hugely important. I am just looking at a report from University College London (UCL) where they looked at a selection of fatal and life-changing crashes over the past few years in London, three-quarters of which happened at or near junctions. Junctions are really key and there needs to be a shift in approach whereby we put the safety of cyclists and pedestrians at the forefront of junction design. That process is still on-going and I would like to see it --

Darren Johnson AM: Sometimes with the plans, I see complaints from local residents that they are seeing some cycling improvements but not the pedestrian improvements or vice versa and so on. Do they have that formula right in terms of actually meeting the needs of both pedestrians and cyclists?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Yes, I would support what people have said about the need to reduce pedestrian crossing times and also in terms of cycles as well. There is research that looks at people cycling and how long they are prepared to wait before they will go across a junction on red. We need to make sure that we are not just designing something and saying, "If people use it as planned, they will be safe". We need to look at actual behaviour and make sure we are designing for that.

Joe Irvin (Chief Executive, Living Streets): We are active members of the Better Junction Group and it is a very good thing and I agree with everything that has just been said on the importance of it. A problem we have come across is that sometimes designs are presented without sufficient information, specifically on pedestrian comfort levels, which is really important because that is what will affect what people actually do, and also crossing times that we just talked about and waiting times at crossings.

Darren Johnson AM: Thank you. Chris, is this something you have been engaged in at all?

Chris Boardman (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Adviser, British Cycling): There are several. First of all, we are trying to deal with a situation that is developing and it is healthy friction. We have a user group that is expanding on the roads and it is one that we want to encourage.

The one that everybody has to dodge at the moment, because it is very political, is that you only have a finite amount of space. Even Rachel [Aldred] then steered around the word 'prioritise' first and for me that is at the crux of a lot of this. You have a finite amount of space and you have to choose who uses it. The logical thing to do is to prioritise the people whom you want to encourage most, which is for me walking first, cycling second, public transport and private vehicles. That is going to involve some pain and that is going to involve some change. Going back to the modelling, I was listening to the discussion and there was an assumption that a longer journey is a bad thing. That is a bad thing and we need to stop it. Actually, why do people change behaviour? Because there is a better way. That can be done by making this better and this gets a bit worse.

Darren Johnson AM: We make the most sustainable journeys the priority?

Chris Boardman (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Adviser, British Cycling): Junctions should prioritise the people you want to encourage the most and at the moment they do not.

Darren Johnson AM: Yes. That is very, very clear. Andrew, I will put this to you from what you have heard from Rachel [Aldred], Chris [Boardman] and Joe [Irvin].

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): What specifically do you want to put to me, Darren?

Darren Johnson AM: Getting this balance right between the needs of pedestrians and cyclists. How confident are you that TfL is getting that right and also about prioritising both of those properly ahead of the needs of motorised traffic?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): What we have heard demonstrates the many functions that these junctions have to perform and that is why it is a difficult job to redesign them. We are managing it quite successfully. As I say, I am quite happy really with the progress that TfL-led projects are making and the better junction projects are all led by TfL. What have we seen? We have seen four of the better junctions already gone out to consultation plus a whole slew more on the Superhighway and so let us go through. That is probably about 10 to 12 of the 33 Better Junctions that have already been put out for consultation and work is about to start on the first of those at the Oval and then, subject to the Superhighway consultation, probably a further seven or eight of those early next year. Therefore, I am reasonably comfortable with the progress we are making on those.

Darren Johnson AM: Are you frustrated though that here we are in 2014 and from the various previous reviews and programmes and so on we are still waiting for one completed junction project?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I would be frustrated if we were still at this position in a year's time but I do not think we will be. We will see a substantial number of completed or almost completed junctions. However, these are very big junctions with the kind of conflicts and variety of demands as well on them that you have heard described and they cannot be done overnight. No, I am very happy with the progress TfL is making on TfL-delivered programmes. I am more worried about borough-delivered programmes.

Darren Johnson AM: Yes. I want to come both to you, Andrew, and we will hear from the boroughs and the Corporation. There are obviously far more than 33 junctions causing severe problems at the moment and very severe safety challenges and TfL has previously identified those. What capacity will there be to actually tackle other problems on other junctions?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): As you know, the 33 are not the only junctions we are doing. There was a list of 100 junctions prepared for the previous junction review, which was 100 junctions with a total of £19 million or £190,000 per junction on average, which was not enough to do anything serious at any of them, really. Therefore, the junction review element has been scaled down to 33 and the amount of money has been raised to 300 million from various programmes which is almost a 50-fold increase per junction. It is enough to do real and serious stuff at all of those 33 junctions.

However, that does not mean that the other 67 are not going to be tackled. A significant number of them are in other programmes. For instance, eight or nine are on the upgrade of Cycle Superhighway 2 that we have just finished consulting on. The Mile End Road/Burdett Road junction, for instance, is one of those. There are lots of others. There are some others on Vauxhall Bridge Road that were in the 100, that we are upgrading as part of Cycle Superhighway 5. There are some others on the list that we are upgrading as part of other programmes and some others that we are upgrading as part of the mini-Hollands and the Quietways borough programmes. There are going to be significant improvements at a lot more than 33 junctions.

Darren Johnson AM: OK. We will come to Councillor Bell, then. Julian, you have just heard from Andrew that he is feeling confident about TfL's delivery but is more concerned about the borough delivery. What do you have to say on that?

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): I do not share that view. Again, it is the point that I made earlier in terms of boroughs having the local knowledge on the particular junctions. They have the engagement with their residents immediately around those junctions. At London Councils, we are encouraging TfL to engage with the boroughs at the earliest possible time so that we can make sure that the designs and local aspirations for those junctions, where it is a TfL-led one, are incorporated. The boroughs will be able to deliver but these are complex projects and we do not want to get it wrong because, once it becomes an almost permanent thing, it is very expensive to take it out.

Darren Johnson AM: Yes, we do not want to waste public money on half-cocked schemes and we also want to avoid lulling people into a false sense of security as well, which other previous junction designs have sometimes been accused of. Is funding the biggest barrier now, would you say, in terms of what the boroughs have to do?

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): That is a question for Andrew, really, because we get our Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding through TfL.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): As I have said before, if anyone is concerned that they are not getting the funding they need or they are not getting the commitments they thought they had, then I want to hear from them because I have been clear to TfL that that has to come across. You have heard from Julian that it has in his case and I hope that is happening in every borough. It would be very useful actually for the Committee, as you have done, to ask for an account of what actually has been delivered and what has actually been asked for in each borough.

In terms of things like the junctions, as you know, the 33 junctions is a TfL-led programme. Not all the 33 are being delivered by TfL but it is a TfL-led programme and it is going well. All the 33 junctions in the programme I am reasonably happy with. It is some of the other things. As I say, I am concerned that we have been out to consultation on a lot of really big and complicated schemes but we have not been out to consultation on many much smaller and less complicated schemes.

Michael Welbank MBE (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee, City of London Corporation): Just taking up the question of junction design, we in the City had to deal with deconstructing some of the enthusiastic traffic engineers' work of the 1960s and 1970s and they are big, major infrastructure.

Darren Johnson AM: Yes, absolutely.

Michael Welbank MBE (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee, City of London Corporation): Holborn Circus we have done. Aldgate we are doing and is underway now, we are coming up to Bank junction and we are just moving on to the St Paul's gyratory. Those are major physical infrastructure projects and they take time because we know with Aldgate it had been going about seven years before it hit the ground. Holborn Circus was similar. Starting on the St Paul's gyratory now, I do not see it hitting the ground for five to seven years. That is the nature of major changes inside a city fabric. We are moving as fast as we can but those timescales are fixed. I do not see how you get around them because of consultation, legal requirements, getting the funding and getting the design right, as you point out. Those are the sorts of timescales.

Darren Johnson AM: Can I come back to Rachel? Is this going to cause fundamental problems, just that timetable, in terms of London getting geared up to be a cycle-friendly city? If we think to a few years' time, hopefully we have made big advances on Cycle Superhighways, on Central London Grid, on Quietways and so on. Yet still, when cyclists get to the most dangerous most difficult part, they are still left to fend for themselves. Could this be the single biggest blockage in the system in terms of getting London as a cycle-friendly, safe cycling city?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Yes, and you could argue it is unfair to create routes that give people the perception of safety and then when they get to a junction actually the same risks are built in. I get worried when I see, actually, coming from TfL and some of the boroughs plans for junctions that in some cases still include nearside cycle lanes and advance stop lanes when there is left-turning heavy-goods traffic in significant amounts. We know that that is dangerous. We know that UCL report on life-changing and fatalities in London shows that many of these are caused by that kind of design. We should not be seeing those designs. There needs to be a step-change as well as the process being sped up, yes, because it is not fair to give people routes that create predictable hazards at a time when they need protection most.

Darren Johnson AM: Obviously we do want to see proper consultation and local engagement on the plans and we do not want to see badly done schemes that have to be redone again in a few years' time that lull people into a false sense of security. Is it just a case that we have to grin and bear it for the next few years while this junction programme works through or are there practical things that LCC thinks can be done that could speed things up?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): Ultimately the speed and the level of consultation is a political and policy decision. I would just remind people that there are predictable hazards. We know that people will die or experience life-changing injuries if we have a road network with these kinds of hazards in place and so that needs to be taken into account.

Darren Johnson AM: I assume you would then be calling for increased spending and more capacity at TfL to deliver these projects if it was to be a higher priority.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): They are very complex schemes. There are obviously a range of users to be considered but these junctions are working particularly badly for cyclists. If we look at the collision risk and if we look at the risks, for example, for women cycling in central London related to heavy goods vehicles and deaths or life-changing injuries, people's lives are ruined by these kinds of things, even if they survive.

Darren Johnson AM: Thank you. Thanks.

Navin Shah AM: I have a couple of questions for Andrew. We asked TfL for information about the 500 junctions they reviewed in 2012 in the initial exercise. In the first instance they refused to give us the information, we had to put in a Freedom of Information Act request and that took nearly 20 weeks. What do you think TfL has to hide? Why will they not come clean and be transparent and accountable to elected members?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): There has been a certain amount of misunderstanding about this and I am quite keen actually to correct the misunderstanding about this programme. Let us be

clear: improvements were never proposed under this programme at anything approaching 500 junctions. The 500 were candidates from which 100 were selected for improvements, and nor were the 500 the most dangerous, intimidating or high-volume junctions. They were basically selected for examination on two criteria. First, they were on one of the four existing Superhighways, that is 375 of the 500. Many of those were unsignalled side roads for private accesses. The other 125 were schemes in development under TfL's programme. Actually, many of the worst junctions now being tackled under our programme did not even appear in the list of 500, let alone the 100 selected for actual improvements. For instance, Parliament Square was not in it. The Tower gyratory was not in it. Highbury Corner, Lancaster Gate, Spur Road, Woolwich Road and the ones with gyratory; none of those were in it. That is why I am quite keen to get the information out just to put this in the correct context.

Navin Shah AM: I am a bit conscious about time, but we may pick this up outside this meeting. Similarly, there is also frustration about getting information from the Mayor's Office because we asked the Mayor for a progress report for these 33 junctions we have been talking about. Again, we were not given that information. What do you think is the reason? What does the Mayor have to hide? Is it the fact that 33 will not be completed or what is the situation? Can you explain?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Where are we at in terms of the information we provided to you on the junctions? Have we given you dates and so on for them yet?

Valerie Shawcross CBE AM (Deputy Chair): We had the information on the 500 data and we know from information provided to the Budget [and Performance] Committee a year ago that there are going to be ten which will be fixed by May 2016. We would quite like to know the status of all of them. Sorry to interject here.

Caroline Pidgeon AM (Chair): No, it is fine.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): No, that is perfectly fair.

Navin Shah AM: The information we want is very valid and very appropriate here. The fact is that a progress report on 33 which are being planned is information which we will not get; I do not know why. The second one is: what do you reckon? How many might be completed before the Mayor leaves office? Let us put it that way.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It will be about 10 to 15 or thereabouts. We have never said that all 33 would be done by 2016 because of the kinds of issues that you have described; they are big and complicated junctions. If you want predictions of when the others will be completed, I have certainly seen a document - and I think I cleared it for release - that did say that. Having said that, I need to stress they are only predictions because obviously some of them stretch some time into the future and they cannot be taken as definitive promises that this will be done by 31 May 2019 or whenever it is. I am pretty sure a document of that sort has been prepared; I have cleared it for release to you.

Navin Shah AM: Sure, it would be useful if we can have for all 33 estimated dates as programmed.

Caroline Pidgeon AM (Chair): We have had that --

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): You have that, all right.

Caroline Pidgeon AM (Chair): -- come through in the submission. There is a link to an online website with that. We have that.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): I am pretty sure it has been published as well.

Caroline Pidgeon AM (Chair): We will pull that out and circulate it to Members to make sure we have all that. We are going to move on to how we get more people cycling and the issue of diversity.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Andrew, the Mayor's Transport Strategy says that he will wish to see 5% of all mobile journeys by bicycle by 2025. To achieve this, what do we need to do? How do we make it more easily achievable?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): You pointed out in your press release about this session - and you were right to - that cycling is still disproportionately white and male, and that is something I talk about a lot actually. We need to get a much greater variety of people cycling, more black and ethnic minority (BME) people and also more women and more older people as well. The way we are going about that is to create genuinely attractive cycle routes, for instance, as other Members of the Committee were saying, that older people might be more comfortable about cycling. That is one of the things the Quietways are for and it is one of the reasons that we are doing these segregated lanes in the city centre as well.

We are starting to see a change in the composition. We are seeing more BME people doing it, actually. You notice that anecdotally in the street and you notice there has been a big rise in the overall number of cyclists. The actual number of people cycling in London is now at an historic high. It has never been higher since we started counting it. After a couple of years in which growth slackened off, it is now shooting up again. Of course we cannot really meet our targets for getting more people cycling unless we get more women and more BME people cycling. Like it is roughly a third BME.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Are there any specific programmes which you have targeting these communities --

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): We do not have specific programmes targeting BME or --

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: -- or women or the disabled?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It is difficult to know how you could do that on a large scale. I did ask actually, one of the criteria in the mini-Hollands bid was come up with proposals to target non-traditional communities. Depending on the social makeup of your borough, in some parts of outer London it might be BME, in Ealing for instance, a huge BME population in Southall. In other parts it might be older people, and actually there were not very many convincing proposals on that and that was in the end one of the criteria that nobody came up with anything particularly convincing. It is hard to see how you could do that specifically, but what I want to do more generally is to create routes that appeal not simply to the fast young man on a speedy bike in lycra. The 'de-lycrafication' of cycling is how the Mayor has described it and that will have benefits across the communities of London.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Rachel, I am sure you have an academic view on this matter.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): I would agree with Andrew [Gilligan] that definitely it is quite worrying that we have not seen that

diversification of cycling. I have co-authored a paper looking at changes or rather lack of changes, as it turned out, between the 2001 and 2011 Census figures and we can see that in inner London while cycling has gone up the gender balance among commuter cyclists has hardly changed. There is not really any discernible change and actually the representation of older people among commuters has declined. We are not seeing a shift towards greater equality.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): The ethnicity has changed a bit but, yes, I agree with that.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): In terms of census data?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): Yes.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): I have not done a detailed analysis of that but you cannot actually compare the ethnic makeup of cycle commuting between 2001 and 2011 because the data was not collected in the same way in 2001. Certainly people from ethnic minority groups are often under-represented cycling in London and this under-representation is often greater than it is in other places. Obviously there are a lot of different factors involved.

I would make the point though that people who were under-represented among current cyclists tend to have stronger preferences for being away from motor traffic, segregation, quiet routes and so on. Andrew [Gilligan] is absolutely right that we need to build those kinds of routes. We can do more though to evidence this and to look at what we are doing. For example, I remember talking to councillors in Bristol who said that they had built an extensive route in the south of Bristol even though the fact that it was not middle-class hipsters. People lived there who were not the low-hanging fruit but they thought it was really important to build it anyway because in terms of a local authority promoting equality and access to infrastructure.

I would like to see, in London, us looking more closely and maybe doing an equality and diversity audit of where we are building and what communities have access to the better quality routes that we are building. Anecdotally it is easy to think that things are changing but I would like to see evidence and analysis from TfL looking at how the makeup of cycling is changing on a year-to-year basis, maybe doing additional research or maybe using existing data. We need to focus in on that much more closely and also in terms of promotional strategies, just to mention something interesting.

You have to build the better routes. That is the really crucial thing, but a student of mine did a Master of Science degree looking at barriers to cycling among the black community in Camden and she found that obviously there are a lot of things that are common to many communities; safety, for example. One comment that somebody made in the research was, "If the pastor cycled, then maybe I would think about it." Actually, religious leaders are a potential group there that could be used within cycle promotion if they are interested in it. We can think of better promotional strategies but really building is key and building in the right places where people can access routes.

Joe Irvin (Chief Executive, Living Streets): I want to just say that Andrew [Gilligan] said about building the right sort of infrastructure and maybe what is missing here is that you can build the infrastructure and it is really crucial, as Chris [Boardman] said, and some people will therefore go to it and it is necessary. Actually, you do need to invest in behaviour change if you are going to change behaviour and we do this in walking and we are working with walking ambition cities and there are cycling ambition cities which you might draw from

on some of this. You do have to put some effort into persuading people and making it acceptable, even making it cool, among certain people. You cannot force people to go and do these things and maybe some people are not going to do it if they are not going to feel comfortable doing it. My goodness, you can put a lot of effort into trying to find out what will relieve their fears and what will motivate them to do it and make it feel a bit of fun.

Michael Welbank MBE (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee, City of London Corporation):

Yes, because we have talked about cycling but cyclists always end up somewhere. They have somewhere to arrive at. Over there - and I have just been looking at it - we have created just over 25,000 cycle parking places, over there. When this is being done, people want higher-level facilities at the destination and this is one way of making it more attractive to a wider diversity of people. You do not just fling your bike on some railing just outside and go to work. You have to stop, maybe change, go to the loo, have a wash and then go to work, and that would do a lot. We are doing it over there and that ought to be encouraged.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: That is great, Michael.

Chris Boardman (former Olympic cycling champion and Policy Adviser, British Cycling): I was just going to point out that there is actually a programme. British Cycling has a memorandum of understanding in place with TfL now of course and it is quite small beer at the moment, but it started the Breeze women's-only cycling programme and they took out 850 participants this year. The structure is there; it is small at the moment but there are opportunities and for led rides as well. On the led ride programme in the London area, 55% were women and 45% men. There are some programmes there but infrastructure to do that on is a given.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Right. Julian, you are a borough with a lot of BME communities.

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): Indeed. I was going to talk about Harrow, though, first, because in London Council's submission to the Safer Cycling Strategy there was a proposal that Harrow take part in a pilot in terms of trying to promote cycling among BME communities. That offer is there if TfL want to take that up. Equally, in our mini-Hollands bid we did have a Southall element in it. Again, I am trying to remember whether we proposed Quietways in Southall as part of our mini-Hollands bid and I do not think it is one of the Quietways, but we will have to check that, Andrew.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It is, actually. Yes, we are definitely doing some Quietways in Southall.

Councillor Julian Bell (Chair of Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): Is it? If it is not, it should be and, again, it is small scale but we have an excellent women-only cycle training and rides programme specifically in Southall. That has been very successful and it is just doing more things like that.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Rachel, the people who want to have safety and they want to be away from the motorised traffic; is there any specific research looking at why these groups have not taken up cycling as much as the white, male, employed person?

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): It is the stronger preferences. For example, the evidence is very good on women that both men and women say, "I want to be cycling away from motor traffic", but women say it much more strongly than men do. There is a whole range of reasons for that, for example, attitudes to risk may differ between men and women. The key thing is that if you build the kind of routes women want, then they are routes that are good for men

as well. But between 2001 and 2011, we were building often bus lanes, advanced stop lanes, things that make cycling a little bit better but are more attractive really for that more risk-tolerant demographic. There were also things with some communities in terms of where people are living. People may not be living in a place where you have good cycle network connections and that is why it would be quite important to look at where we are building and look at connecting those communities and look in more detail than currently happens in attitudes towards cycling, the makeup of cycling and which communities are under-represented and so on.

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): There is a strong attachment in Indian subcontinent populations to the car and if you look at the map of Ealing and where the potential cycle journeys and cyclists will come from, it is actually all to the Ealing and Acton, east of the borough. There are some interesting cultural questions about why there is that attachment to the car. It is partly because immigrant communities come from the Asian sub-continent and come to Britain and see a car as a kind of symbol of advancement and of economic prosperity. They have all ridden bikes back home and they tell me all these stories about how they have ridden their bikes back home but it is seen as being a retrograde step. They are shocked when they see me as the Leader of the Council riding my bike because that does not fit my status. I should have the Mayor's car and should be polluting the atmosphere with the Mayor's car.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Andrew, just one more thing. You tried a pilot in Hackney with these e-bicycles or e-bikes to help the people who are less able and the elderly to cycle. How has that gone?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): We are doing a pilot scheme in Haringey because it has hills and the idea is a fairly small scale e-bike public share scheme like the Barclays Cycle Hire scheme only on a smaller sort of scale. It is roughly parallel to the W7 bus route, if you know where that goes, Finsbury Park to Crouch End and Muswell Hill. We will have some docking stations along there and we are making some progress on that. I am having some discussions with TfL about costs and I do not agree with their estimate of cost. It is too high, certainly far higher than other comparable schemes. That is where we are at on that particular stage.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: When will it be launched then or is it already?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): As soon as we can agree about costs, I suppose.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: What is your expectation?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): It is going to be, I would say, at least a year off yet but we have done the feasibility study. We have had some good discussions with Haringey. They are very keen and have written to us saying, "When is it going to start, please?" I am keen to get it as soon as possible.

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Great. Thank you, Andrew.

Caroline Pidgeon AM (Chair): We are going to move on to safety now.

Navin Shah AM: At spring this year, TfL conducted its Attitudes Towards Cycling survey which has thrown up some very interesting and quite worrying statistics. First of all, in general, the findings show that safety concerns remain the key barrier to cycling. Then it goes on to say that this year perceptions of safety among all Londoners have actually worsened. I will give you three rather stark statistics here: 94% feel cyclists are vulnerable to other road users, and that figure was 90% in 2013; 92% believe traffic makes people afraid of cycling on the streets, and this figure was 85% last year. The last one here, 25% believe cycling is a safer way

of getting about, and this figure was 29% in 2013. We accept that perception does not quite reflect the actual situation but still there is a clear issue we have here about perception.

Can I ask generally and invite comments from members on the panel on what can be done to improve perception of safety over and above the measures that we have been talking about? Even in the schemes that we have talked about, how can that be improved? Andrew.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): You are absolutely right to make the distinction between reality and perception. The reality is this: cycling is significantly safer than it was in terms of both deaths and serious injuries. Serious injuries came down last year by about 28%. There were 75 serious injuries. That is still far too high but a lot less than the previous year, even though cycling went up. Overall, obviously, that is only one year but the long-term trend is also for a reduction in serious injuries and a reduction in the absolute number of serious injuries even though the number of cycle journeys in London has more than doubled. The same trend was even more pronounced in deaths. In 1989, for instance, the peak year for deaths, there were more than 30. There were 33 deaths of cyclists in London, even though cycling was about a third of the level it is now. Last year, as you know, there were 14. This year so far there have been 12 or 13 depending on whether you count somebody in Richmond Park. Again, that is too high but proportionally it is coming down. It has roughly halved in the last ten years.

That is the actuality. That is the reality. The perception, I agree, is different. The perception is getting worse. That is partly because of the focus there has been - the understandable focus - on deaths and serious injuries in the media over the last couple of years. You will remember that dreadful time about a year ago exactly, actually, when we had six deaths in a fortnight. The answer to perception is the same answer as for everything else, actually. It is to get these routes in and to get schemes in that persuade people that it is safe to cycle on. That is why it is so important to get continuous segregated Superhighways in, for instance. The vast majority of accidents in fact happen at junctions; 85% of accidents, serious accidents, to cyclists happen at junctions. If it was simply about the reality we could probably achieve a significant reduction in serious injuries just by segregating junctions and not bothering with the links, the bits in between the junctions. Actually, we are segregating the links as well because of the perception and need to address the perceptions that they are not safe. The answer really is the same as the answer to every other question, which is to get the routes in and get the infrastructure in.

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): Yes. One of the key statistics which has already been referred to is the number of serious injuries or fatalities that include lorries. Tackling lorries and trying to improve safety around lorries is key to delivering safe roads and improving perception. We have been working very hard at London Councils, through TEC, and with TfL on our London Safer Lorries scheme which, yes, we have sign-up from all of the boroughs. We have now issued the appropriate traffic orders and the notice of intent was published on 5 November through to 1 December 2014 and basically that will ensure that lorries have to have sidebars. They have to have extra mirrors and they have to be retrofitted in order to operate in London. This is a higher standard than the Department for Transport which is extending its requirements for more vehicles to be retrofitted, but actually we have a higher standard that we are implementing.

That is something that will improve things and hopefully improve people's perception of safety because the one thing as a cyclist that gives you warning signs when you are out there on the road is junctions and lorries. That is where the potential real high risks are.

Michael Welbank MBE (Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee, City of London

Corporation): I will just add that a contributory factor is coming back to this behaviour aspect because in our own road danger reduction plan, education or training or influence about behaviour is pretty critical. We all have a responsibility not to be guilty of inattention to what is going on around us and to have some foresight about what is going to happen next and inconsiderate behaviour. All those things affect the attitude that people feel on the streets. We have these physical measures, we have these regulations and we have safer lorries. Of course we do; excellent. Behaviour is also a component and preaching that as hard as we can is an important aspect, I believe.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum,

LCC): One really important issue that has not been looked at enough is around near-misses and incidents that do not result in an injury but can nevertheless be very off-putting and it has been an area where I have started doing some research recently. What research there is suggests that these incidents do have a big impact on people and they are really common. The research that I have done is showing at the moment - we are still doing a lot of analysis on it - three incidents per cycle trip. When you think about it, some of these are negligible but some of these are really quite upsetting. They are intimidating. They are not the kind of thing you would want your child to experience and certainly they are not the kind of thing you would want to experience yourself. There is a whole range of things. There is inattention but there is also incivility, there is rudeness, there is aggressive driving; there is a whole range of things that we need to address.

However, also what is coming out from that and from other research in the area is the contribution to infrastructure as well. Hopefully, looking more at near-misses and these kinds of things can tell us what kind of infrastructure design put cycles into this kind of position and so looking at things that do not happen. Thankfully, deaths are quite rare. There are 14 cycle deaths a year, which is too high, but not enough that you can draw that many conclusions from it. Therefore, looking at the almost incidents is something we need to do more of.

Chris Boardman MBE (Former Olympic Cycling Champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): I

could just add to that. What I do not think we have covered - and I have personally experienced it and it has not been explained in the last couple of years, certainly to my satisfaction - is that we have a conflicting message and it is specifically to do with junctions. I know we are learning the message and infrastructure is changing where we have a cycle path down the inside of vehicles and a space at the front and it says, "Go down the inside of this vehicle", and then most of those deaths are happening by vehicles turning left. In every other system that we have in place, there is a Plan A and there is a Plan B. If I make a mistake, you are covering and vice versa. We do not turn right without looking in the mirrors when we are driving a car and yet now it is a habit. You will have to forgive me. I cannot recall the exact Highway Code or which particular portion of it, but there is a mandate to look left before you turn left in a car and we have forgotten about it. That piece of education needs to be brought back because we either need to change the infrastructure - and we are - or we need to tell people what the rules are around it because it is confusion that is the problem. Cars turning left historically, we do not look. We go. We just turn left. It is a reasonable assumption to make and that is where the majority of accidents are happening, yet we put a lane there for cyclists and a space at the front but we have not told people how we deal with that juxtaposition. I do not think it is within the gift of this city to say, "People who drive in the city, you have a responsibility to look in your mirror", and cyclists or any should have a responsibility. If something is indicating left, do not go up the inside. That piece of information is missing.

Joe Irvin (Chief Executive, Living Streets): If I can just add, it would be remiss of me not to say that there are many more people knocked down or pedestrians and killed but there is less hoo-ha about it and that is

important as well. I do not know if there is an elephant in the room - I mentioned it once - but a big factor, it seems to me, is the number of boroughs who have brought in a standard 20-mile-an-hour zone. It cuts the number of deaths and injuries; it cuts the number of collisions for motorists, as well as for pedestrians and cyclists. Obviously, it needs to be handled properly, but a number of boroughs are doing that now and it is effective.

Navin Shah AM: Chair, if I can ask my last question to Andrew and Julian [Bell], what do you think are the specific factors behind the 2% decrease in cycling casualties in inner London while it is a 5% increase of casualties in outer London? What measures do you think can be brought about to improve safety in outer London, which obviously is a concern at the moment?

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): That is all casualties, is it, not just serious? It is serious --

Dr Onkar Sahota AM: Sure.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): OK. One of the reasons cycling has become safer is simply there are more cyclists on the roads and drivers are more attuned to them. They actually physically take up more space on the roads. That is much more the case in inner London than in outer London and it is notable that driver behaviour is different in different places. I was cycling outside London altogether in a suburban part last week and it was very noticeable that drivers were less careful than they are in central London. That is not because they are any worse people. It is just that they are not used to cyclists in that particular part of their own counties.

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): I guess potentially it could mean that we need to put more investment into outer London to tackle some of the junction problems. I know the 33 we are talking about are all in central London.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): No, they are mostly in central inner London, but there are some in outer London.

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): They are predominately in central London. That is something to think about. I absolutely agree with Andrew [Gilligan] about the numbers of cyclists and it is also as you get more cyclists. If it is your family or a relative who is a cyclist and somebody in your family is a cyclist, you will start to be a lot more conscious of other cyclists on the road when you are driving because you are thinking about your particular family member and their safety. It is about increasing the numbers partly and getting that kind of increased numbers and capacity. We need to do more investigation as to why that is.

Richard Tracey AM: Just one final question and it is about this conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. Those of us around here who are politicians get pretty constant complaints from pedestrians. It can be walking pedestrians of varying ages but particularly the elderly and then young mothers and fathers trying to push buggies and indeed those who are in wheelchairs. The constant cry is that there are far too many cyclists who cut them very short of space or they are riding far too fast on pavements and so on. How do we get across perhaps to the cyclists that they actually do need to be so much more careful of pedestrians and more considerate? Otherwise, good relations just disappear. Joe, you are probably the first one.

Joe Irvin (Chief Executive, Living Streets): Allow me to answer that first. First of all, perhaps you are exaggerating the amount of conflict there is. As I said before, 90% of the time the things that are good for cycling are good for walking and vice versa. There is a small percentage of problems that can be caused and cycling on pavements is an issue for people. We should be looking ahead with all of these things, as we said earlier. We are going to have more people of an older age and we are going to have more people in wheelchairs, mobility scooters and what have you and so that is something we should take into account.

Something that is missing in some of the plans - and I mentioned before the floating buses - is that in some of the countries where they have them, there are very clear signals to everybody concerned that the pedestrian has the right of way there, really. They have a different colour of pavement. They raise the level to make it level with the pavement and the bus. They have the warning for the cyclists to say, "Please slow down. Give priority to pedestrians". I see very little of that in this country, even in London, probably, I would say.

Perhaps just like we were talking about motorists, they are not evil people, motorists, but we do want to get motorists to be more aware and be careful and be considerate and lovely drivers. Not that they are evil people, but we want to try to get them to be more aware and that is the same with every user. I am sure you can have inconsiderate pedestrians. Framing it like that probably exaggerates the idea that there is massive conflict. There are ways of doing it and probably we do not do so much of those easy things, as I just said, colouring the road, raising, showing little signals to people to please slow down here and the pedestrians have right of way here. We do that less than in other countries.

Richard Tracey AM: Chris, you are an influential voice in the world of cycling. What can you do?

Chris Boardman MBE (Former Olympic Cycling Champion and Policy Advisor, British Cycling): I have had to discuss this a lot. The first thing I would like to do is just make the distinction between inconsiderate and just downright rude in safety because, statistically, it is incredibly low the amount of incidents that are between cyclists and pedestrians because the speed is relatively low and the mass is very low. It is inconsiderate and it is rude.

The second point was you were just saying and we discussed earlier that a cyclist is a person. Somebody driving a car or walking are just people and they all have the capacity to be rude and inconsiderate. I would agree that signage can often help. I use a segregated or a path up the Wirral Peninsula where I live and it is just a standard sign on a piece of wood, "Cyclists give way to pedestrians. Pedestrians keep your dog under control", and it just says the status quo for this area and that is what it is.

Then, lastly, I have always said that where there are rules and regulations, they should be enforced. When you cannot enforce them, then you start with those that can do the most harm and work down from there. That, for me, just gives us some kind of perspective framework to work to.

Dr Rachel Aldred (Senior Transport Lecturer, University of Westminster and Chair of Policy Forum, LCC): I pretty much really just endorse what Chris [Boardman] said, but also just to say we are experiencing big changes in London to cycling and walking. Hopefully, these changes will be good for everyone, but we will all have to change our behaviour. We will all have to learn new rules and floating bus stops or bus stop bypasses are an example of that. We need to monitor them; we need to maybe change the design; we need to evaluate it; we need to make sure we get it right. It is really important because if you have a segregated route but cyclists have to mingle with buses, then it is not a segregated route and so we need to do it, but we need to make sure it works fair for one and that the most vulnerable are not feeling intimidated.

Richard Tracey AM: Gentlemen, in the City, what is the feeling there?

Iain Simmons (Assistant Director City Transportation, City of London Corporation): It is a very interesting question, as Michael [Welbank] said. We have lots of people on foot and an awful lot of people who cycle as well. What we experienced was that speed differential. The cyclists in particular were saying, "Please slow down the motor vehicles", and cyclists typically move about 15 miles per hour. If you have cyclists at 15 miles an hour and vehicles at 20 miles an hour, then they are not operating in the same decision-making timeframe. Where that differs then - the question you ask - is where the cyclist enters the realm of the predominately pedestrian and you have the similar speed differential that the cyclists do not like when they are in with motor vehicles, as well as the size of the vehicles, with 15-mile-an-hour cyclists and two or three-mile-an-hour pedestrians. Because there were so many people there and a lot of people cycling, we experienced this early and I know it is something that is contentious with some of the cycling groups and even with Andrew [Gilligan].

The thing we found that works best in our world is to take everything away, all the signs, the lines, the bits and pieces that makes it very subtle and try to deal with that by design. People say, "Who has priority?" The answer is nobody. That environment means that the cyclists where they are mixing in with pedestrians - and there about 70 locations dotted around the City of London that is over the river where that happens - they mingle at an appropriate speed and that behaviour then generates good behaviour and occasionally people are upset and spooked but they are not being injured by it and all the rest of it. We kind of deal with that by design and trying to bring movement down to a level of the lowest common denominator, which is the movement the pedestrians experience.

Cllr Julian Bell (Chair, Transport and Environment Committee, London Councils): Chris [Boardman] earlier talked about a kind of hierarchy in terms of deferring and so pedestrians have priority first, cyclists, then buses and public transport and then private vehicles. If you look in Europe, that is enshrined in legislation and part of the Highway Code. That is something we should have and then it is there. People are taught it when they do their driving test theory and you are giving them that education.

Andrew Gilligan (Mayor's Cycling Commissioner): A lot of this is about novelty, actually. Like you, I imagine, we get more people complaining about cyclist and pedestrian interaction than we do about pedestrian and car interaction which, on the face of it, is crazy because the number of pedestrians injured by motor vehicles each year is 1,700. The number of pedestrians seriously injured by cyclists is about ten. It was nine in the last year I looked at, 2011. That is partly to do with the fact that it is fairly new and the presence of large numbers of cyclists in London streets is fairly new. It is something that has only happened in the last 10 to 15 years. It is something people are getting used to and it is part of the getting-used-to process.

Similarly, with floating bus stops, again they are more or less universally used in half the cities of Europe and without any great difficulties. They have been operating for more than a year in London on Cycle Superhighway 2 in Stratford without any difficulties whatsoever. People became used to them very quickly and they will get used to them here as well.

Richard Tracey AM: Yes. You talk about novelty. One novelty that I probably just ought to mention but I do not want to start a great debate is that I am also hearing from quite a lot of people that maybe we are getting to the point when cyclists will need number plates so that they can actually --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): We are not getting into that this morning, Richard.

Richard Tracey AM: -- be recognised when there is an accident but, as I say --

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Goodness, we are not opening that can of worms. Thank you very much.

Richard Tracey AM: We will not start that one.

Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM (Chair): Fantastic. We have had a really interesting debate this morning and this afternoon. Thank you all very much indeed to Andrew, Julian, Iain, Michael, Rachel, Chris and Joe. It has been really helpful.

It feels to me like a lot of progress is being made but there are clearly some concerns and some potential risks. Leadership, which Chris [Boardman] mentioned, at a borough and London-wide level, which was in our original report a couple of years ago, that leadership and serious money are needed to deliver this and are going to be key. Thank you very much indeed for your time. We really appreciate that. We will be pulling this together into some sort of letter on the new report with some recommendations to the Mayor and others.