



Promoting and  
supporting cycling  
in Southwark

## **Comments on London Borough of Southwark Draft cycling strategy 24th January 2015**

Southwark Cyclists is the Southwark group of the London Cycling Campaign charity number 1115789. There are approximately 1200 LCC members in Southwark making us the largest local group. Southwark Cyclists predates the London Cycling Campaign, the latter being established on 28 September 1978 – see <http://lcc.org.uk/articles/london-cycling-campaign-history>.

We welcome the aim to normalize cycling, as we do the plans to reallocate road space to pedestrians and cyclists, and the realisation that the police are key to reducing road danger in Southwark.

### **Principle 1: Stress free cycling**

Evidence and experience show it is not stress but fear that stops people from cycling. 'Stress' does not do justice to the intimidation and danger that motorists can pose to cyclists. Bristol Council (see [www.bristol.gov.uk/press/first-cycle-strategy-aims-get-everyone-peddalling](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/press/first-cycle-strategy-aims-get-everyone-peddalling)) aims for freedom from fear.

#### **Objective 1.1 Address conflicts between motor vehicles, particularly HGVs, cyclists and pedestrians, as well as perceptions of conflict.**

We welcome the objective to address conflicts. This conflict is real. New cyclists experience driver behaviour as intimidatory and dangerous. Hardened cyclists get used to it. But the danger is real, not just perception.

#### **Objective 1.2 Ensure drivers do not exceed the new 20mph speed limit**

Many drivers are law-abiding and will obey speed limits when they are aware of them. The easiest, cheapest wins will be gained by making these drivers aware of the limit -- through painting it on the road and signs, smiley faces etc. Perhaps a sign could be attached to the borough-entrance signs. "You are now entering a 20mph borough. Please do not break our speed limit". The council should set targets for speed reduction across the borough and on specific roads.

Department for Transport (DfT) guidance says:

*“Successful 20 mph zones and 20 mph speed limits are generally self - enforcing, i.e. the existing conditions of the road together with measures such as traffic calming or signing, publicity and information as part of the scheme, lead to a mean traffic speed compliant with the speed limit. To achieve compliance there should be no expectation on the police to provide additional enforcement beyond their routine activity, unless this has been explicitly agreed.”* [[Department for Transport \(2013\) Setting Local Speed Limits – Circular 01/2013](#)]

Drivers who do not obey the limit will therefore have to be persuaded to do so. The DfT suggests that the limits must be self-enforcing, that is that the layout of the road effectively precludes speeding, generally known as traffic calming. The effectiveness of traffic-calming should be checked by measuring mean average speed before and after work. These figures should be published and quantifiable speed reductions targets should form part of the overall traffic management strategy.

Very high speeds can be very dangerous and intimidatory over short distances. Speed cameras should be placed on known trouble spots where traffic-calming might be difficult and average speed cameras over longer stretches of road.

We believe that at least two sections of borough road in Southwark need to be dramatically reworked to appear credible in a 20mph environment – Camberwell Road south of Wyndham Rd and Newington Causeway. Rodney Road and Heygate Street also need treatment.

We also note that several roundabouts e.g. the southern roundabout at the Elephant and Castle where traffic speeds up on the roundabout as there is more lanes space than on the feeder roads. All roundabouts should have one lane for each direction only to reduce traffic jostling for position and speeding up on the roundabout

Speed can be designed out of roads and traffic reduced by modal filters. These facilitate one mode of traffic but not another. It is also known as filtered permeability. Used strategically modal filters can allow residents and cyclists unimpeded access while removing rat-running through traffic and implementing 20mph by default.

This can play a key part in delivering number 9 of the Fairer Future promises to revitalise our neighbourhoods and make them nicer places to live;

***Promise 9 – Revitalised Neighbourhoods*** *We will revitalise our neighbourhoods to make them places in which we can all be proud to live and work, transforming the Elephant and Castle, the Aylesbury and starting regeneration of the Old Kent Road*

Southwark Council should commit to installing speed limiters in their vehicles and provide a timetable for this. Advisory ISA (Intelligent Speed Adaptation) helps; and mandatory ISA ensures that drivers keep within limits.

We ask you to install ISA on all Council vehicles and require your contractors to do the same. We hope you will join other boroughs, and press TfL (Transport for London), to do so also. TfL is trialling ISA on buses (Action 9 of the Mayor's Cycle Safety Action Plan).

### **Objective 1.3 Work closely with the police**

Local police officers have been given the task of improving traffic safety. Southwark Council should build on this. Police should be invited to meetings of the Joint Cycling Steering Group to cover traffic law enforcement and its role in improving safety on the roads.

The police prioritise crime as defined by the Home Office. This does not include summary motoring offences which can be tried in the Magistrates Court. Thus the offences most likely to kill or injure a cyclist are not considered to be criminal. The London Assembly has called on the MPS to prioritise road crime (driving offences) and for road crime statistics to be reported alongside crime statistics. Southwark Council should support this change by asking the Southwark Police and MPS RTPC for data on traffic law enforcement.

Southwark police cycle squad should be supported and encouraged to feed back to local cyclists and councillors through the JCSG (Joint Cycling Steering Group). ASLs (Advance Stop Lines) are not adequate to keep cyclists safe at junctions.

Information on cycling accidents and injuries should be systematically collected by Southwark Council and discussed with the police and other relevant organisations. Patterns, such as the well-known danger posed to cyclists by left-turning vehicles, should be designed-out as they occur. Other sources of important data should be incorporated to form a comprehensive intelligence picture of accidents involving cycles. For example, The Near Miss Project (<http://www.nearmiss.bike>), a joint project of the University of Westminster and private partners, uses crowd-sourced data on near-miss cycle collisions to draw London-specific conclusions about patterns of risk that are not captured by STATS19 data.

Southwark Council should commit to supporting the MPS' Community road watch activities in Southwark. Starting examples must include;

- ✓ working with TfL (Transport for London) and the MPS Roads Transport Policing Command to produce an annual traffic law enforcement report in Southwark (TfL is committed to producing a London wide report but we need it at the local level);
- ✓ providing a community reassurance meeting after each local cycle death, as we requested last year

### **Objective 1.5 Improve driving standards and awareness of cyclists**

We welcome Southwark Councils' plan to target driving instructors. We would like to discuss how Southwark Cyclists could support this effort and ensure that driving instructors were properly informed of cycling good practice. There is significant scope for information- and expertise-sharing between these groups.

We support the promise to lobby Central Government to require cycle training as part of driving test.

### **Objective 1.6 Restrict HGV movements**

Southwark Council has signed LCC's safer lorry pledge and we commend Southwark Council's pledge to become FORS Gold Standard, the highest level possible. Planning regulations need to ensure that development projects are managed so that lorry danger is minimized.

Welcome and booming property development in Southwark will necessarily pose increased dangers to cyclists (and pedestrians) by HGVs and delivery vans. We ask you to require (via section 106 mechanism) that all but the smallest developments meet the following conditions;

- ✓ CLOCS-compliant Construction Management Plans;
- ✓ consolidation of deliveries, especially during the fit-out phase, to reduce the numbers of dangerous and intimidating "white vans"

We urge you to work with TfL (Transport for London) and other boroughs to emulate the successful Paris restrictions on lorry movements.

## **Principle 2: Cycling as a priority**

### **Objective 2.1 Work with TfL to segregate routes over 20mph or where traffic volumes are high.**

High motor traffic volumes, or average speeds significantly over 20mph, form vital arterial or connector routes throughout the Borough. However to cyclists these routes form often impermeable barriers as well as constituting extreme hazards, even for experienced cyclists.

**Segregation along these routes is important for safety and perception of safety; it is a *necessary requirement* to increasing levels of cycling**

We are also concerned that routes need to be for 24 hours per day use – day and night. We are clear that parks even with lit paths are not considered safe by even some of our more experienced members and so on-road night time alternative to routes that cross parks are vital.

### **Objective 2.3 Reallocate road space from motor vehicles to cycling and walking**

Logistically straightforward, but politically difficult, this is bound to arouse some opposition: it will not happen without determined political will and a commitment to long-term improvements in the Borough. Annual reporting on amount of road segregated, closed or subject to filtered permeability would make it possible to monitor progress on this.

All one-way streets should be made two-way, at least for cyclists. Gyratories should be closed and, where possible, one arm taken out of circulation as a public realm gain.

Redevelopment of the Aylesbury and Heygate estates should incorporate on-road segregated cycle lanes along Thurlow St and Albany Road. Roads where no parking is permitted currently should remain no parking after redevelopment and the space allocated to cycling. New development should make no allowance for on-street parking. Developers should be expected to make arrangements for parking within their developments if they wish, as is common in other dense urban areas.

### **Objective 2.4 Allow for pedestrian and cycle priority implementing filtered permeability schemes and, where possible, closing roads to motor vehicle traffic**

Modal filters could be used at many places in Southwark to protect cyclists and clear areas currently dominated by the noise, pollution and danger of rat-running traffic. Amongst others: Elephant Road, Upper Ground (at the east end); Union St at the junction with Redcross St or Great Suffolk St; the Cut (in the middle); Bermondsey St (in the middle); Portland St (in the middle); Cooks Rd (in the middle); and Camberwell Grove (by the railway bridge).

Closing roads can be unpopular in the short-term but brings a public realm gain in reduced noise, pollution and traffic danger. It frees children to play outside (a public health gain) or to cycle to school. Trials should be considered to allow public to experience the benefits as well as the feared detriment.

These schemes can transform areas for residents, but they can also be controversial. Evidence from other cities shows that following road closures, residents strongly support the closures' continuation once they have experienced benefits to safety and liveability first-hand. We hope that you can work with Ward councillors to explore proactively many places where the Lytham Street scheme (p23) can be replicated. Linking with Safe Routes to School and with Play Streets could be useful in some areas.

**Objective 2.5 Secure cycling improvements through the regeneration and planning processes.**

The large scale redevelopment of the Albany and Heygate estates offers unprecedented opportunities to redraw the roads and provide segregated on-road cycling on roads bypassing the development and filtered permeability on roads going through. We hope the council will seize this opportunity with both hands.

Incoming residents will bring no expectations of on road parking and this should be avoided from the start. The provision of excellent cycling infrastructure will encourage the young professionals, who make up the majority of cyclists today, to want to live and work in Southwark. They will bring higher expectations of quality of life and well as much welcomed revenue.

Where long-term developments (such as the Aylesbury estate) mean that works are ongoing for a significant period of time, it is essential that cycling and walking infrastructure which is technically 'interim' (but may be in place for a number of years) is as coherent, direct and safe as the rest of the network.

**Objective 2.6 Maintain cycling infrastructure and surfaces as part of our maintenance work programmes**

We support this. A poor road surface is a danger to cyclists and makes travel very unpleasant. We note that the significant compensation bill paid out to cyclists in Southwark will increase as cyclist numbers increase, unless the road surface is proactively improved.

**Objective 2.7 Unlock the potential of our cycle network, identifying barriers to connectivity**

Please see other comments above.

### **Principle 3: Cycling for everyone**

We encourage Southwark Council to welcome and support The Bike Project, a new initiative in Southwark which provides bicycles to refugees.

**Objective 3.1 Work with a broader range of groups, including local children, parents, older and disabled residents, black and ethnic minority community groups to improve access to cycling.**

The council should build on Southwark Cyclists expertise developed during the Grange project to roll out similar opportunities to other groups

**Objective 3.2 Ensure all households who want to cycle have access to affordable cycles.**

We welcome Southwark's decision to join the popular LCC bike loan scheme.

**Objective 3.3 Aim to provide and facilitate secure cycle parking for every home.**

This is a key need. With a population growing to 350,000 and an aspiration of 10% cycling by 2016, about 35,000 spaces will be needed in homes and a similar number at schools and workplaces, plus thousands at shops, stations, gyms, etc.

We urge you to increase provision on Estates and invite residents to apply for on-street bike hangars. We would want you to review planning restrictions on cycle storage sheds and bins in front gardens; and to install Sheffield racks on carriageway build outs (with cycle bypasses), rather than on footpaths.

**Objective 3.5 Support cycle hire intensification and expansion**

We support this action. The lack of cycle hire coverage in Southwark is particularly anomalous given the Borough's proximity to the centre, topography, social deprivation comparative paucity of public transport provision (while affluent and well-connected West London gets an extension). The Council ought to be making this point extremely publicly.

**Objective 3.6 Design infrastructure, including parking, to accommodate different kinds of cycles.**

This is very important for inclusion. Cycling is a mode of transport available to disabled people who cannot always access public transport or use a car. In these circumstances many disabled people can manage a tricycle or a recumbent. Cargo bikes can be used for shopping, transporting children or delivering goods. They take vans off the road for local deliveries. Sheffield stands on the edge of the pavement will not be suitable for these types of bike. The draft London Cycle Design Standards 2 gives clear guidance on acceptable dimensions for inclusive / freight cycling.

**Objective 3.4 Ensure enough parking for everyone in the household in new developments at a ratio of 2 bike parking spaces per dwelling.**

We consider this is a minimum and that one space per person per dwelling would represent a proper ratio.

**Objective 3.7 Design and deliver a cycle network that is accessible to all cyclists, particularly children, those with mobility issues and those with heavy loads .**

Please see comment on 3.3. We note the understanding of the role of bollards to protect against motorised scooters and urge that police enforcement replace physical measures so there can be space for cycling.



### **Principle 4: Cycling for health and well being**

Buses, lorries and other diesel vehicles are big contributors to dirty air. In 2008 there were more than 4,400 deaths in London because of air pollution. Pollution is worst in inner London. More than 7% of deaths in Southwark are estimated to be due to air pollution.

People living in deprived areas are more affected by poor air quality, partly because these areas are often near busy roads, which have higher levels of road traffic pollution. A map of Southwark's air pollution shows that the pollution follows the main roads, the Walworth Road and Old and New Kent Roads, and is highest inside the congestion zone.

But there is also high pollution along Albany Road between the Old Kent Road and the Walworth Road and along Queens Road and Peckham High Street then down Rye Lane to the Common. These are busy, dangerous shopping streets with high levels of air pollution.

The recent GLA report on air pollution and public health listed 68 possible benefits to public health and estimated that increasing walking and cycling would contribute to 19 of them.

#### **Cycling as part of integrated 'Active Travel' package**

We suggest that cycling is promoted as part of an 'active travel' package, i.e. individuals are shown how they could replace a private car with a combination of transport modes: cycling, walking, car-sharing schemes, home delivery of groceries, public transport, hire of cargo bikes etc.

Approaches to this include:

- ✓ publicise existing initiatives such as cycle training, Dr Bikes, the bike hire scheme starting in 2015, led rides and walks. Consider setting up an email newsletter along the lines of Imove Lambeth
- ✓ work with partners such as Zipcar (some Southwark regeneration schemes already provide membership of Zipcar) and TRAs
- ✓ work on a one-to-one basis with parents/carers of children who receive cycle training to identify ways to replace car/bus travel with active travel. This could be part of a public health work on tackling obesity and heart disease

## **Principle 5: Cycling as an investment**

### **Objective 5.1 Recognise the economic value of cycling**

Cycling is cheap and convenient. For most journeys in London, cycling is also fast and often the fastest mode of transport (as [TfL data shows](#).) This compares favourably with London-wide average speeds (all modes) of around 8mph (*London Travel Demand Survey, 2013*) and means that, especially for trips shorter than a few miles, Southwark residents and businesses can reap the benefits of investment in cycling infrastructure. Short trips such as these in fact form a majority of most trips in Southwark, as with most urban centres: research in Australia showed that a third of car journeys were under 3km or 1.1 miles, and slightly over half were under 5 km or 3 miles. Those are perfect distances to cycle instead.

Complementary to this, car ownership in the Borough is low. In 2001 51.9% of households in Southwark did not own a car; by 2011 this had risen to 58.4%, and by 2013 to 62% (*LTDS, 2013*). This could partly be explained by the sinking affordability of motoring, and partly by investments in public transport. Whatever the reason levels of car ownership are far lower than both London and UK-wide averages: in 2011, 41.5% of London, and 25.8% of English households didn't have a car. Despite this, motor traffic infrastructure investment is routinely prioritised ahead of cycle-specific investment; this despite the fact that measurable economic multipliers for cycling investment are far higher than other modes (*Sustrans*; see below).

By supporting bike travel now Southwark stands a chance of avoiding the downside of mass car ownership altogether.

Cycling will reduce current and future over-crowding on Southwark's public transport network. Demand is forecast to increase significantly by 2021, because of population and employment growth. While extra capacity may be needed, cycling can take up some of the slack and reduce the numbers travelling short distances on buses and trains.

### **Objective 5.2 Improve cycle parking in city centres, destinations and stations**

Independent research undertaken by Sustrans using government methods of analysing the economic benefits of transport schemes has shown that investment in cycling (and walking) routes can have a cost benefit ratio of 20:1 compared with a ratio of 3:1 for rail and road schemes.

Most cheap and efficient is cycle parking. On the streets most parking is car parking (there are still more drivers than cyclists) but cycle parking generates five times as much spending as car parking. That's mostly not because cyclists are richer but because you can park a lot of bikes in one car parking space. For retailers, increased cycle traffic is a particularly attractive proposition because evidence shows spontaneous impulse shopping rates increase, as do business discovery rates. Cycling and walking drive sales to all retailers, not just national chains able to provide off-street parking (see below).

Obviously taking away all car parking and putting in five times as much cycle parking instead wouldn't immediately generate five times as much spending. Not enough people cycle yet. But encouraging cyclists by gradually taking away car parking and substituting bike parking would be a sensible economic strategy for local shops.

### **Objective 5.3 Support businesses using cycling as a key part of their activity**

Money saved by cycling is spent in the local economy.

Chicago devised "People Spots", replacing car parking during the summer months with outdoor seating, and cycle parking to attract walkers and cyclists (and their money) to local shops and businesses. These spots work for consumers and retailers.

One survey showed People Spots encouraged neighbourhood shopping and in many cases prompted passers-by to stop and make unplanned purchases. About 80 percent of the business owners said the spots were good for business because they encouraged foot traffic. Some said they saw a 10 to 20 percent increase in sales after the spots were installed. More than 90 percent of the consumers surveyed said the spots "improved the vibe" of streets.

Cyclists spend more when they get off their bikes. They are allowed to drink and cycle so they spend more in cafes and bars. A study in the US showed that car drivers outspend cyclists per trip to the shops but cyclists shop more frequently and spend a third more over all. Plus the places cyclists go are more likely to be convenience stores, bars and restaurants. They spend locally rather than at supermarkets miles away.

Cycling also represents a growing industry in its own right worth. A report by the London School of Economics estimated that cycling was worth £2.9 billion to the UK economy in 2010 from bike sales, cycling accessories and maintenance and wages. Within Southwark the direct contribution of cycling to the local economy is increasing visible with several new bike repair shops springing up throughout the borough since 2011 and cycle-friendly cafes spreading along Peckham High St, Choumert Road and Rye Lane.

The majority are locally owned, employing local people and recycling investment further within the Borough: so cyclists spend and the money goes back into the local economy. Nice places to cycle and also nice places to live work and visit. If more people cycle local streets become safer, with more going on and a more vibrant urban culture. This helps walkers and shoppers feel more secure and confident, contributing to social cohesion.

Cyclists have more to spend too. The annual cost of running a car is well over £6,000. In 2011 the RAC put the cost of running a new car at £6,600 a year and a second-hand one at £4,700. The cost will only have gone up since then. In 2006 average family in London spent £21.60 a week on public transport and over £56 per week on a car. Most of this sum is not spent locally and returned to the local economy, but goes instead on fuel, insurance, central taxation and depreciation. Liberated by cycling, all this cash is available for cyclists to spend on something else.

Swapping a car or a bus for a bicycle or increases an individual's or family's spare cash dramatically. Of particular importance to Southwark, lower income families spend a much higher percentage of their incomes on food, utilities and rent and spend it more locally. For them, any extra from not having a car protects essential spending and even frees up funds that can be enjoyed or invested in education, housing, or starting a business.

**Objective 5.4 Future proof the borough for cycling with all new developments to invest in cycling**

We entirely agree with this objective providing several of our proposals elsewhere here e.g. increase cycle parking spaces per dwelling are also agreed. And that facilities are built in such a way that increased cycling resulting from better facilities can be accommodated.

**Objective 5.5 Promote cycling to visitors.**

Cycling should be promoted to visitors and residents through natural intermediaries, such as bike shops, GPs and driving instructors (p20). Children should be encouraged through school travel schemes.

Herne Hill Velodrome is a nationally and internationally significant cycling arena of historic importance. It should be marketed as such to international visitors and to local people seeking fun and achievement.

## **Principle 6: Cycling as easy as walking**

**Objective 6.1 Develop a cycling culture by marketing cycling as practical and something everyone can do easily, and learn at their own pace and manner.** No amount of marketing will over-ride personal experience of danger and discomfort. Previous marketing campaigns have failed to raise cycling rates long-term where new cyclists are intimidated and give up cycling after a few weeks. The best advertising will be seeing happy people cycling safely and with obvious pleasure through the borough. If the cyclists look stressed, harassed, frightened, surrounded by danger they will not look like people you want to join.

**Objective 6.2 Create a cycling brand for Southwark: when you think of cycling, you think of Southwark.**

We do not support this specific objective. It is likely to be expensive and pointless unless a lot of work has been done on making the roads a lot safer. Cycling spreads by word of mouth. When a friend tells one of us that she is frightened to cycling to Choumert Road from Brockley because her route down Peckham Rye East is so dangerous, and we cannot think of an alternative, cycling in Southwark is unsaleable. She will be saying the same thing to everyone she meets.

**Objective 6.3 Ensure Southwark Council is an exemplary employer, developing a cycling culture within the council and actively supporting more staff to cycle**

This is important. The more members of the council who understand the problems cyclists face the more understanding there will be of the importance, personal and economic, of overcoming them. Increased cycle-to-work rates are also associated with reduced sickness and absenteeism through injury, decreased employee stress, and better staff retention. Providing adequate workplace facilities including changing and showering facilities will be an essential part of delivering this objective.

**Objective 6.4 Ensure marketing campaigns are targeted, and show everyday people of Southwark cycling.**

All marketing must come after extensive preparation. Otherwise people will start to cycle, have frightening, dangerous experiences and stop. It will be harder to persuade them to try again.

**Objective 6.5 Continue to work with children and parents to ensure cycling becomes ingrained at an early age**

Parents will not allow their children to cycle on the roads if they, rightly, perceive it to be dangerous. As cycling in Southwark becomes safer, public health messages delivered by midwives, health visitors, GPs and other healthcare professionals can encourage cycling (and walking) as everyday means of transport. Currently parents are actively discouraged from cycling with young children by some healthcare professionals, even though this is commonplace in places with a high modal share. Bike shops should be encouraged to stimulate and exploit latent demand for the parent pound.

**Objective 6.6 Work together with businesses, organisations, cultural and religious groups to culturally integrate and promote cycling.**

We support this.

**Southwark Spine: Routes**

We feel that the key to the expansion of cycling in Southwark is developing a network of protected routes on appropriate main roads. We welcome the proposed Spine route and the open-minded approach to traffic reconfiguration on the Lend lease and NHHT estates in the orth of the borough. Excellent pro-cycling provision here will set a standard for development in the more southerly parts of the borough where reconfiguration is harder to achieve.

We would also like to see improvements on the original LCN 22 and 23 routes, especially the removal of the Bellenden gyratory and any other feature that is a major snafu e.g. no light crossing on the Quietway that crosses Tower Bridge Road. We hold that one major snafu on a route makes it useless.

Many people in Southwark commute to work in central London. They need fast, straight routes, on-road and available early in the morning and late into the night. On the way back they have time to stop and smell the coffee. On the way to work they don't.

Routes through parks are good for those learning to ride, taking pleasure in the journey, with time to enjoy the greenery and good-naturedly dodge the pedestrians, dogs, toddlers and shopping trolleys who share the space. Conflict should be planned out not in.

Routes are not enough but need to be part of area-wide planning for cycling. A mesh of cycle-friendly streets is needed for the local journeys residents will want to make, to the shops, with their children to school, to the station, to bus stops, and to work.

The best, cheapest way of building a mesh is strategically placed bollards in the middle of the road. We commend them to the council's pocket and Southwark's future.

**Leadership**

*Southwark Council We will lead by example*

As part of Southwark Council's promise to lead by example, we ask that they commit to;

- requiring cycle training with any of its staff driving council vehicles or even those driving vehicles on Southwark contracts
- report annually on the percentage of staff cycling, with targets set
- review the impact that Kickstand sessions had on council policies
- audit their Fairer Futures the next time these promises are reviewed as cycling is related to several of them and could be incorporated in Promises 2, 7, 10

### **Laws (p58)**

A key change needed is with turning traffic being required to give way to through traffic. This is common practice in Europe and places more responsibility on drivers, including lorry drivers, to ensure it is safe to turn. Safe overtaking distance may need to be better defined.

Southwark Council should also support the introduction of presumed liability, as Hackney Council has done. Under these proposals, common in places with high modal share (and currently under consideration in Scotland), a hierarchy of road users is established. Pedestrians – the most vulnerable and slowest – are at the top, then cyclists, then other road users. Private motor cars – well protected and manoeuvrable – lie at the bottom. In any collision liability is automatically presumed by the lowest form of transport in the pyramid; so cycles have liability towards pedestrians, busses towards pedestrians and cycles, and private cars are presumed to be liable in all collisions. This would generate much debate on the duty of care owed vulnerable road users, and also ameliorate concerns about cycles' duty of care towards pedestrians.

### **Funding (p59)**

Southwark Council should monitor and report it's cycling spend per head of population, as Edinburgh and Bristol do. We note that the All Party Parliamentary Group on Cycling has recommended a £10 / head annual investment in cycling, a suggestion which the Government's draft Infrastructure Bill (currently in first reading stage) recognises by allocating strategic status to cycle infrastructure funding for the first time.

### **Targets**

Credit is owed to Southwark Council for adopting a casualty rate target. We believe that it is the first council to do so.

We have previously suggested higher targets than those set out on page 50 and would ideally like to see a target of 20% modal share by 2025.

At present, the only cycling target specified is for share of total trips. We ask that cycling targets include both;

- share of commuter trips
- share of children cycling to school

The latter was proposed as the key indicator at the recent conference on *Enforcement and Road Danger Reduction: how policing can promote walking and cycling in London*, which Southwark Council hosted.

We ask that Southwark Council produce a bicycle account as recommended by Sustrans. Introduced in Copenhagen, Bristol (reference above) has committed to producing a bicycle account every two years, and so should Southwark. Key performance indicators should be agreed with Southwark Cyclists.

Ends

Southwark Cyclists

[www.southwarkcyclists.org.uk](http://www.southwarkcyclists.org.uk)

southwark@lcc.org.uk

January 2015