

Review of London's Road Safety Plan

Response from preliminary consultation

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The London Road Safety Plan was published in 2001, following the adoption of the Mayor's Transport Strategy earlier in the year. TfL, working with other members of the Pan London Road Safety Forum, is reviewing the Plan and will be publishing revisions later in 2004.
- 1.2 As the first step of this review stakeholders with an interest in road safety in London were sent a questionnaire that sought ideas and suggestions on how the Plan should be changed. The responses that are described below identify new ideas and initiatives which the respondents think would contribute to the lowering of casualties as well as those measures which they thought have already worked well. The questionnaire and covering letter is attached as an appendix.
- 1.4 Over 300 stakeholders were sent questionnaires in April 2004 and 54 replied. Half were from the boroughs, with engineering consultancies and police officers being the next largest groups.
- 1.5 The majority of respondents thought that engineering measures had been most successful in reducing casualties, followed by speed control through cameras and education initiatives. Looking forward there was strong support (more than 70% of the respondents) for expanding activity on engineering measures, 20 mph zones, advertising campaigns, pedestrian facilities, training and work within schools. Over half the respondents said that there should be more safety cameras
- 1.6 Speed humps were the only existing road safety measure that significant numbers of respondents said should be reduced. Seventeen percent of correspondents thought that there should be more speed humps, 44% thought there should be no change and 37% thought that there should be fewer speed humps.
- 1.7 When asked what should be done that is not being done now the biggest response (16 out of 54) was for more enforcement and traffic policing, followed by education / training and tackling powered two wheeler casualties
- 1.8 When looking at changes at European or national level new technology was the most frequently quoted change (15 responses) that was sought. There was wide-spread support for investigating in-vehicle technology to advise of or control speeding. However respondents also mentioned potential difficulties of public acceptability and possible dangers from taking responsibility from the motorist / motorcyclist.
- 1.9 Greater powers to deter drivers who are not licensed, or with cars that are not registered were called for by several respondents under different questions.
- 1.10 More effort on publicising the benefits of safety measures such as speed cameras was called for as a way of tackling the negative image

in the media. Providing the evidence of the benefits was seen as helpful and one respondent thought that it would be useful to carry out research into why people did not support road safety in a positive way.

- 1.11 More road safety education and training were identified by two thirds of the respondents people who offered suggestions for tackling the higher than average casualty rates of afro-caribbean children.
- 1.12 Increased publicity and public engagement were identified as a way of encouraging the public to play a greater and more positive role and improved co-ordination between the road safety agencies in London.

2. Profile of respondents

Table 1 – Respondents’ organisations

Organisation	Number of Individual Respondents
London boroughs	26
Engineering consultancies	6
Law enforcement agencies	5
NGO's: Other	4
Other local authorities	3
Government departments	2
Government committee	2
NGO's: Safety related	2
Health Organisation	1
User group	1
Not stated	2
Total	54

- 2.1 The 26 responses from the boroughs came from 23 boroughs. An analysis was also done of the type of posts held by the respondents and this is shown below in Table 2.

Table 2 Type of post held by respondents

Category	All respondents	Borough respondents
Engineer	10	9
Planner	8	6
Road Safety Officers	8	6
Consultant	6	
Enforcement Officer	5	
Traffic/Transport Manager	3	3
Research Officer	1	
Health Professional	1	
Other	9	2
Not Stated	3	

3. Summary of Responses

Q.1 Road crash casualties have declined in London since 2001. What road safety measures have been most useful, in your experience, in helping to reduce casualties?

Table 3 - Response to Question 1

Road safety measure	Number of respondents citing the measure as most useful
Engineering / traffic calming measures	37
Speed/safety cameras	24
Education and training initiatives	17
20 mph zones	11
Better pedestrian facilities	9
Local safety schemes	7
Vehicle design improvements	5
Public awareness / marketing	4
Vehicle activated warning signs	3
Highlighting hazards	3
The "Think" campaign	2

3.1 This question, as well as all the others apart from question 2, were unprompted. This allowed respondents to make as many suggestions as they wished.

3.2 Sample responses:

“Safe routes to schools safety schemes.”

“Enforcement activity (inclusion within MPS Policing Plan 2003/4) – although very difficult to measure ‘cause and effect’.”

“BikeSafe – “

“Existence of a strategic plan and some partnership working towards targets.”

“In the longer timeframe, we believe improvements in vehicle design (e.g. airbags, ABS, ‘friendly’ front ends) and legislative changes such as the wearing of seat belts will have had a far more significant effect on casualty numbers than engineering measures.”

Q.2 Do you think there should be more, less or the same amount of safety measures that we are currently using?

Table 4 - Response to question 2

Safety Measure	Support for the measure - % of all respondents		
	More	Same	Less
Engineering measures at “hot” spots	81%	19%	0%
Training and work in schools	81%	17%	2%
Pedestrian facilities like crossings	75%	23%	2%
20 mph zones	74%	21%	6%
Advertising campaigns	70%	23%	6%
Safety cameras	58%	34%	8%
Cycle facilities like cycle lanes	58%	28%	13%
Speed humps	17%	45%	38%

3.3 One respondent declined to answer the question directly as he thought it was not a very well structured question, and responded as follows:

“This question adopts a far too simplistic approach to a complex subject and is potentially misleading. Measures need to be appropriate to the circumstances in each location and to simply say we need more 20mph zones (for example) is not a sensible way to proceed.

More effort does need to be put into the 'passive' areas such as advice, training and advertising to help improve the standard of use of the highway (by all user groups) with a corresponding decrease in the interventionist approaches such as traffic calming and over-engineering the highway.

Where engineering schemes are introduced, the measures should be commensurate to the scale of the problem each one is intended to address. Many schemes try to cover every conceivable risk by applying the full arsenal of measures. An incremental approach could be more effective, for example starting with less aggressive features initially and then modifying schemes in light of experience.”

Q.3 Is there anything that is not being done now, that should be introduced to help reduce casualties?

Table 5 – Response to question 3

Type of Measure	Number of respondents who suggested the measure
More enforcement and traffic policing	16
Education / training	11
Addressing / researching powered two-wheeler issues	9
Better advertising	4
Better use of technology	3
Vehicle activated warning signs	3
Greater co-ordination between relevant parties	3
More traffic police	3
Better funding	3
Harsher penalties	2

3.4 Sample responses:

“Better co-ordination of engineering and ETP (Education, Training and Publicity).

“Use ETP to target specific vulnerable groups.”

“Powered two wheelers (P2Ws) need to be addressed. One suggestion is a display that boroughs could borrow to ensure standard London-wide approach.”

“Increased enforcement/high visibility traffic policing.”

“Better speed enforcement – over whole road links not just spot speed”

“Aggressively remove untaxed/unlicensed vehicles from the road”

“Enhanced parking enforcement”

“Continued drink driving/drug driving campaigns”

Q.4 What changes at national or European level, such as new legislation or vehicle standards, driving or other matters, could help reduce casualties?

Table 6 – Responses to Question 4

Type of change	Number of respondents citing the change
New technology for vehicles	15
Education and training	9
Vehicle safety legislation	9
Enforcement/traffic policing	7
Breath testing for alcohol and drugs with increased penalties	7
Researching the powered two-wheeler issues	3
A lower drink-drive limit	2
Investigation and enforcement of work-related road safety	2

3.5 **Sample responses:**

“Compulsory training for new motorcyclists before they are able to use the road”

“Pedestrian friendly car fronts”

“Police need the power to detain and remove a vehicle driven by an uninsured or unlicensed drivers. It is quite ludicrous that DVLA can detain vehicles for non-payment of road tax the police cannot detain for more serious offences ”

“Use of Black box technology to limit speeds”

“The police should start traffic policing again”

“Lower drink drive limit”

“Refresher driver training”

“HSE Investigation and enforcement of work related road safety”

Q.5 Are there any organisational changes that you think would assist in improving the effectiveness of road safety work in London and if so what are they?

3.6 Greater co-ordination between the various stakeholders was seen as the most important organisational change to improve road safety (17 respondents). Giving police a traffic-policing role (2), driver education (2), and promotional awareness and public relations (2) were also mentioned.

3.7 **Sample responses**

“Better co-operation and co-ordination between adjacent boroughs would improve the effectiveness of road safety”

“Better consultation with boroughs on ETP activities, particularly opportunities to influence London-wide activities and increased advanced notice of publicity campaign dates to enable local support to be properly programmed. A calendar of events would be helpful”

“Discussion with boroughs about road safety issues on the TRLN needs to be improved”

“Lack of consistent approach to road safety education investment within boroughs. Very few (any?) complying with guidance to have one RSO per 50,000 head of population.”

Q.6 What scope do you think there is for new technology in cars or lorries that controls speed or monitors progress, to improve road safety?

3.8 Over half the respondents (34) thought there is great scope for new technology in vehicles. However there were queries as to the political will to introduce such technology, and public acceptance of new technology. It is also seen as a long-term proposal, and some respondents thought it a waste of resources.

3.9 The most widely suggested new technology is in speed enforcement (19 respondents), Warnings in car (distance, speed) were also mentioned (5), and it was noted that legislation would have to be introduced to facilitate the introduction of any new technologies (2). Concern was expressed (2 respondents) about taking responsibility away from the driver / rider.

3.10 Sample responses:

“It could have an adverse effect by taking responsibility away from the driver”

“On the positive note, warning systems in vehicles could initiate alarm to warn drivers of danger – such as falling asleep behind the wheel.”

Q.7 Certain safety measures such as safety cameras and speed humps have recently been negatively portrayed in the media. How do you think road safety issues could be positively promoted in the media and the public?

3.11 Almost all respondents accepted that safety measures have received negative coverage in the media. Providing evidence to counter the media portrayal of cameras and speed humps (20 respondents), and advertising and publicity of the benefits of these measures (19), were suggested. This could include emphasizing the lives saved by the introduction of these measures and the savings in terms of the cost of casualties (cost-effectiveness), to set against the perception that they are unfairly targeting motorists. The use of graphics to illustrate the difference in casualty numbers before and after introduction of these measures is suggested, as well as the potential casualties if such safety measures were not implemented.

3.12 Sample responses

“The present negative attitudes to speed humps, including the ambulance service reaction, have been around for 25 years. Over this period there has been increasing public acceptance of such measures.

The media tends to be deaf to quantification of effects (although this must still be provided to win the campaign) so needs graphic illustrations of casualties that would have been prevented.”

“Provide the evidence to show that their sites meet the criteria and were they did not have them removed to ensure that each site maintains its credibility.”

“Reduction in road fund licence fee for drivers with no speed/traffic convictions in last 3 years.”

“I think we could learn a lot from countries who have successfully tackled this issue and who consider speeding ‘unsocial’ like drink driving e.g. Australia, Sweden, etc.”

Q.8 Afro-Caribbean children have the highest casualty rate of any minority group. Are there any specific measures you would propose to deal with this issue?

Table 7 – Response to Question 8

Type of Measure Suggested	Number of respondents suggesting the measure
Education and training in English and/or the communities’ home language	22
Further research to identify the causes of these casualty rates	12
Discussions with the Afro-Caribbean community	5
Advertising including the involvement of celebrities and community leaders	4
Addressing social deprivation issues	4

3.13 Sample responses:

“Making it cool to be streetwise by drama/ Junior road safety officers/ streetwise clubs in schools.”

Q.9 How do you think the public could be encouraged to play a positive role in improving road safety?

3.14 The main points raised in how the public could be involved to improve road safety, is through publicity and advertising of road safety issues (17 respondents), public consultation (13), school training (7) and

driver training and testing (5). Public incentives (4) and community schemes (2) were also mentioned.

3.15 Sample responses:

“Recognise personal responsibility”

“This will take generations and it needs to start in schools – should be part of the national curriculum.”

“The key things are for Road Safety professionals to stop polarising the issue, to stop patronising the public and to work harder on doing things which improve road user’s understanding.”

“There is a significant failure to communicate with the public and engineers assume that road users will understand the purpose of measures and how to respond to them, even though the majority of drivers have no formal training or education after they pass their driving test. How many drivers and pedestrians know the difference between a Pelican and Toucan crossing? “

Q.10 Are there any other points you would like to make about how road safety could be improved in London?

3.16 Respondents thought that road safety training should be emphasized (6 respondents), TfL should be more involved (4), issues affecting powered two-wheelers (P2Ws) should be addressed (4) through a range of measures, including deterring motorcycling and more P2W rider training. There should be more enforcement (3) and an increased budget for road safety measures (3), reducing speeds on all roads in London to 20 mph apart from main roads (3) and community/public consultation (2).

3.17 Greater powers to deter drivers who are not licensed, or with cars that are not registered were raised by several respondents under this question and previous ones.

3.18 One respondent asked for a programme of action to prevent cyclists’ deaths from HGVs and skip lorries (detailed proposals were submitted) and also suggested the application of cycling design standards across London, cycle training for all schoolchildren and a safety audit of loading bays on the TRLN. Another respondent called for higher standards for bus drivers and to celebrate the success in driving down casualties to their current levels.

4.21 Sample responses:

“Perhaps TfL could do more to spread “best practice” regarding road safety measures”

“Greater partnership with major organisations employing fleet drivers”

“CPZ’s at town centre and railhead locations to control problems associated with commuter and shopper parking. CPZ’s have many safety benefits particularly in areas where junction sightlines become masked by parked vehicles. “

“Provide commuter parking at strategic railheads.”

“Need for the equivalent of “Crimestoppers” – a mechanism for the reporting of bad behaviour”

APPENDIX

30th March 2004

Dear

Review of London's Road Safety Plan

The Road Safety Plan was published in 2001 and is now due for its mid-term review. As part of this review we are seeking your views on the plan in order to inform our early thinking on any changes.

This is a two-stage process and we intend to consult you formally later this year on a revised plan, based on your ideas and suggestions.

I am pleased to enclose a copy of TfL's progress report on London's Road Safety Plan that summarises our achievements to date, against targets set out in the plan.

A great deal of progress has been made in reducing road casualties. On current trends it appears that we are well on our way to achieving nearly all the ambitious targets set out in the plan. The notable exception is powered two wheelers where increases in casualties have been disappointing. This has largely been due to an increase in their ownership and use.

I have enclosed a brief questionnaire that I would like you to complete and return to –**Dan Falchikov, at TfL's Consultation Unit by 5th May 2004**. The questionnaire asks for new ideas and initiatives that you think would help to reduce casualties along with the measures that you think have so far worked well.

Road Safety in London has benefited from good working relationships and co-operation between the key organisations including TfL, the boroughs, the Metropolitan and City Police forces. Reducing crashes and casualties has been achieved through partnership working and the new road safety plan will build on this.

If you would like a copy of the current Road Safety Plan, or need further information, please get in touch with Dan Falchikov on 020 7941 3909. The Plan is also available on our website at http://www.tfl.gov.uk/streets/road_safety_plan.shtml.

Reducing deaths and injury on London's roads continues to be the Mayor's top priority. I look forward to your response and your contribution to the review of London's road safety plan.

Yours sincerely,

Peter Hendy
Managing Director Surface Transport

London's Road Safety Plan Review - questionnaire

Please complete and return to: Dan Falchikov, Consultation Unit, Transport for London, FREEPOST LON 17390, London SW1H 0YZ by 5th May 2004.

Name:

Organisation:

Position:

Contact details: Tel

email

1. Road crash casualties have declined in London since 2001. What road safety measures have been most useful, in your experience, in helping to reduce casualties?

2. Do you think there should be more, less or the same amount of safety measures that we are currently using?

More
Less Same

Engineering measures at accident "hot" spots like new junction layouts, anti skid surfacing etc?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Safety cameras	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 mph zones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advertising campaigns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Training and work within schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Speed humps	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pedestrian facilities like crossings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cycle facilities like cycle lanes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Is there anything that is not being done now, that should be introduced to help reduce casualties?

4. What changes at national or European level, such as new legislation or vehicle standards, driving or other matters, could help reduce casualties?

5. Are there any organisational changes that you think would assist in improving the effectiveness of road safety work in London and if so what are they?

6. What scope do you think there is for new technology in cars or lorries that controls speed or monitors progress, to improve road safety?

7. Certain safety measures such as safety cameras and speed humps have recently been negatively portrayed in the media. How do you think road safety issues could be positively promoted in the media and the public?

8. Afro-Caribbean children have the highest casualty rate of any minority group. Are there any specific measures you would propose to deal with this issue?

9. How do you think the public could be encouraged to play a positive role in improving road safety?

10. Are there any other points you would like to make about how road safety could be improved in London?

This questionnaire should be returned to TfL's Consultation Unit by 5th May 2004

If you would like an electronic copy please e-mail: danfalchikov@tfl.gov.uk

Thank you for your help