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The Share the Road campaign brought together a number of different ongoing activities around promoting legal and safe use of London roads. The campaign was carried out in September 2006, and the details are covered in this report. The campaign provided a focus for education and media attention and engagement with key stakeholders from a variety of different user groups.
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Section 1 Introduction, Background and Context

Share the Road is a Mayoral commitment, managed by Transport for London (TfL) to catalyse activity that will change anti-social and illegal behaviour by and towards cyclists through engagement with road user organisations. TfL is committed to delivering a campaign to promote mutual respect between cyclists and other road users. This is in response to negative press about illegal and irresponsible cyclist behaviour and customer research that cites this behaviour as a barrier to some new entrants, as well as grievance from cyclists that they sometimes feel threatened by other road user’s lack of awareness or respect of cyclist’s needs and facilities. By encouraging a mutual respect between cyclists and other road users we hope to help towards increasing the status of cyclists and cycling, improve the image of cyclists and continue towards increasing cycling levels in London.

1.1 Background

Research suggests that individuals often consider themselves to be the only skilled user on the roads promoting selfish and sometimes irresponsible behaviour by some, such as speeding and driving under the influence. TfL research on attitudes to cycling\(^1\) has revealed that this view is replicated amongst cyclists in a complex relationship which leads to some post-rationalising irresponsible/illegal behaviour as justified due to other road user behaviour towards cyclists whilst simultaneously condemning other cyclists’ actions.

Whilst attitudes towards cyclists remain, on the whole rather negative to the extent that the behaviour of other cyclists is now being cited a barrier to some new entrants; the TfL and wider promotion of cycling as an activity continue to be very successful. Indeed recent media tracking reveals increased association between cycling and health, cost effectiveness, convenience, and environmental improvement\(^2\). A TfL survey in 2005 showed that 51% of Londoners would feel comfortable being seen on a bike.

The potential for an anti-social stigma to be attached to cycling could not only further alienate and entrench the attitudes of irresponsible cyclists but also lead to acts of aggression, borne from frustration and ignorance, towards cyclists by other road users. The potential to undo the growth of cycling, its safety record and various positive lifestyle associations with cycling is acknowledged in a number of media reports. Where the Mayor and TfL endeavour to raise the status of cycling and cycling levels, negative behaviour by and towards cyclists damages that vision.

While there are reports of significant levels of cyclists ignoring red signals in some locations, the London Road Safety Unit have not been able to detect any evidence to link this behaviour directly to casualty rates.

For this “Share the Road” initiative to carry weight it must be seen to have the support of road user’s organisations, including cyclists, motorists, motorcyclists, HGVs, pedestrians, buses and taxis. Key stakeholders were therefore identified and invited to participate in the initial launch of this campaign.

1.2 Strategic approach

The strategy to address the possible risks of the behavioural issues to TfL policies and investment in the cycling programme has three aspects:

\(\footnote{\text{TfL Attitudes to cycling survey series, 2005}}\)
\(\footnote{\text{TfL Spring 2006 cycling marketing tracking survey, June 2006}}\)
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Education and public relations – communication strategy, including an educational advertising campaign to raise awareness of the issues of illegal and anti-social behaviour by and towards cyclists. The strategy should also include future development options towards a wider road user respect message. The press team will aim to utilise the launch of the advertising campaign and the enforcement operations to heighten media interest in the campaign through timely news releases.

Enforcement – co-ordination of intelligence around ‘hotspots’ for illegal and irresponsible cycling and other road user behaviour and the organisation of enforcement operations.

Stakeholder engagement – liaison with representative user groups to communicate objectives, obtain views on the campaign strategy and seek support for enforcement operations.

1.3 Aims

The overriding goal of the campaign is to raise status of cyclists and cycling, with a focus on irresponsible, selfish or illegal behaviour by and towards cyclists. Target groups include:

- Motorists – To raise awareness of cyclists’ needs and facilities and enforce anti-social behaviour or illegal behaviour that puts cyclists at risk
- Cyclists, current and potential\(^3\). - To raise awareness of other road users’ needs and facilities (including other cyclists) and enforce against behaviour that puts others at risk
- Other road users - To increase understanding of cyclists needs and vulnerability

1.4 Stakeholders

Stakeholders were identified and engaged in commenting on the draft proposals for the campaign and views on its development in subsequent years. The stakeholder panel comprised of cyclist, motorist and other transport organisations which have an interest or expressed position on road user behaviour. The panel comprised of invitees from

- Motorist organisations – RAC Foundation, AA, Institute of Advanced Motoring, Freight Transport Assoc., Road Haulage Assoc, Motorcycle Industry Association
- Cyclist organisations – LCC, CTC

1.5 Report structure

This report sets out the results of marketing activity (Section 2) enforcement (Section 3) press strategy (Section 4) and responses (Section 5) to the campaign as undertaken by TfL in September 2006. Outcomes, successes and lessons learned from this initial campaign are reported, and background information including surveys and enforcement criteria are also included for reference purposes. This collation and analysis of benchmark data and locally based education and enforcement activity will ensure that decisions on future campaigns are made on the basis of the best evidence currently available.

---

\(^3\) This group are least likely to be aware of particular road skills needed for cycling in London and most likely to have changed from another mode to cycling. TfL research (‘Cycling’ – FDS, May 2005) suggests only 38% of cyclists have ever received any sort of cycle training.
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The marketing/communication aspect of the campaign focused on providing a public message of personal responsibility and respect/consideration towards all road users and ensuring that clear, improved information for cyclists and other road users as to intelligent; ‘shared’ use of the road including cycle facilities is available. This was backed up by a series of enforcement operations designed to increase awareness by road users and by cyclists of the risks, animosity/stress, and issue penalties for illegal/anti-social behaviour at key identified locations.
Section 2. Marketing campaign

2.1 Communications approach & outcomes

A key part of the “Share the Road” campaign was marketing the messages to all road users. The first phase of the ‘Share the Road’ marketing communications campaign was launched by the Mayor on 4th September. This was timed to coincide with enforcement activity so that maximum impact could be gleaned with the press coverage.

The campaign included press advertising and posters. It was agreed, in consultation with all stakeholders, that there were four key communication messages:-

- CYCLISTS STOP AT RED
- MAKE ROOM FOR CYCLISTS
- CYCLISTS KEEP ON THE ROAD
- LORRY DRIVERS TAKE CARE

Of these the top two messages were developed and featured in the initial advertising in September 2006.

Figure 1 Press advertising & posters

Where possible both messages appeared alongside each other to give a balanced view. The total cost incurred for the campaign was £220,000 and this consisted of:-

1. Advertising
   - Local press advertising in the Capital package w/c 11th September and w/c 25th September. This covered 49 titles and consisted of two consecutive right hand pages
   - Local press advertising in the London paper on 5th September
   - The Londoner - two pages in October’s edition

2. Posters
   - 350 road side double royal posters running from 6th October to mid-January
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3. Additional activity

- Enforcement activity for Advanced Stop Lines for cyclists is also now highlighted in the revised version of TfL’s enforcement / Penalty Charge notice leaflet.

This media mix should result in 70% of Londoners having the opportunity to see the press advertising 6 times and 55% of Londoners seeing the posters 8 times during the campaign.

2.2 Suggestions for future activity

2006/07

Additional budget has been found to complete the first phase of the planned campaign and it was proposed that the CYCLISTS KEEP ON THE ROAD and LORRY DRIVERS TAKE CARE messages were run in March/April. However, after stakeholder discussion, the image to be used on the Lorry Drivers will be re-shot to feature a rigid lorry rather than an articulated one, and that the Cyclists on the Road creative will be held back until a decision can be reached on the type of image and message that should be presented. Living Streets asked for an assurance that this key aspect for pedestrians will not permanently be dropped from the Share the Road campaign.

The next round of the campaign at the end of March 2007 plans to use 1750 roadside poster sites and show the original 'Stop at Red', 'Make Room for Cyclists' and also some 'Lorry Drivers Take Care'.

HGV and Rigid lorry drivers will also be targeted specifically by distributing 'Lorry Drivers Take Care' creative in the Sun newspaper in March 2007. TfL will also assess options for further distribution through the Freight Operator Recognition Scheme.

At the Share the Road debrief meeting on 13th October the following issues were raised in relation to the marketing communications:-

- All materials and messages need to hang together including a common ‘look and feel’. While the content of the flyer handed out by MPS was good it lacked a clear reference to the campaign.
- The campaign needs to be about ‘hearts and minds’ and must avoid a ‘Nannying state’ feel.
- Consider using cycle champions to get the message across in PR
- Get stakeholders to swap articles in their own publications e.g. cycle article in Taxi trade journal

The latter of these two issues are covered in the next section of this report. The first two points will be considered as the campaign develops over 2007. In addition TfL will consider how the ‘Share the Road’ messages can be included in other marketing communication activities which target key road users i.e. more opportunities like the inclusion in Enforcement activity (As in point 3 above).
2.3 Other Stakeholder comments

Questions/comments raised on the advertising by stakeholders included:

- The ethnicity of the people shown in the images was not clear. They appeared to be white European [note: in fact one was Hispanic, one mixed race and one Afro Caribbean - although seen from rear on bike] (Adam Coffman, CTC)
- The cycle facilities shown in the “Stop at Red” poster for the cycle advanced stop box were illegal (Simon Brammer, LCC). Stakeholders were advised that sign off procedures with CCE have now been improved.
- What tracking has there been on the advertising? (Adam, CTC). The TfL Omnibus survey which will be carried out in Spring 2007 will be used to detect changes in attitude against existing trends.
- The consultation process on the creatives needed to leave more time for stakeholder comment. (Simon, LCC). Stakeholders were advised that the GLA deadline for this round was set at 4th September. Future executions in 06/07 and 07/08 will consider the need for extra lead in time.
Section 3. Enforcement Activity

3.1 Ongoing enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Focus of enforcement</th>
<th># tickets issued 05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking attendants (Boroughs)</td>
<td>Motorist offences</td>
<td>Approx 5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking attendants in LB</td>
<td>Motorist offences</td>
<td>4059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster (share the road streets ONLY)⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic wardens (TLRN)</td>
<td>Motorist offences</td>
<td>304,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera enforcement (TPED)</td>
<td>Motorist offences</td>
<td>73,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera enforcement (Boroughs)</td>
<td>Motorist offences</td>
<td>n/k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan police (pan London)</td>
<td>Motorist &amp; cyclist offences³</td>
<td>n/k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOCU teams (key corridors)</td>
<td>Motorist &amp; cyclist offences³</td>
<td>n/k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPCSOs (pan London)</td>
<td>Motorist &amp; cyclist offences³</td>
<td>n/k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London (total)</td>
<td>Motorist &amp; cyclist offences³</td>
<td>6877 (of which 1349 to cyclists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London (Snow Hill cycle squad)</td>
<td>Motorist &amp; cyclist offences³</td>
<td>1210 (of which 321 to cyclists)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Educational material

3.2.1 Leaflets

Police teams currently use/distribute educational, promotional leaflets relating to cycling. These include

- Immobilise⁶
- “Hop off the pavement” (Camden Council)⁷
- City Police leaflet on ASLs⁶
- London Cycle Guides: safety advice (Islington Council)

TOCU officers devised and distributed an information pack at some of the enforcement locations for Share the Road (see Appendix 1)

Local operational teams decided what to use for their individual enforcement operations. However, if there is agreement on the content of the existing MPS documentation, it may be possible to produce more professional versions of this for future campaigns.

A “No Know” leaflet has also recently been produced by TfL aimed specifically at drivers. It includes a section referring to Cycle Advanced Stop Boxes (ASLs) indicating clearly that it is not legal for drivers to enter them. This leaflet was commissioned independently by TOCU, but forms part of the overall TfL education campaign. The “No Know” campaign includes general billboards, on bus marketing and the accompanying leaflet (300,000 copies) will be

⁴ Data obtained from Westminster further demonstrates the number of tickets issued for parking offences at the location/junctions enforced by TOCU during the Share the Road operation in that Borough. These were Trafalgar Square/St Martins in the Fields, Junction of Millbank and Vauxhall Bridge/Vauxhall Bridge Road, Junction of Rochester Row/Warwick Way and Vauxhall Bridge Road, Junction of Shirlands Road/Elgin Avenue and Junction of Enford Street / Marylebone Road

⁵ FPNs issued related to cycling offences = 2376 (see Appendix 3, Figure 16)


⁷ http://camdencyclists.org.uk/camden/councilleaflets/pavement.pdf
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widely distributed by TOCU and London Boroughs. Although TfL has developed a 'menu' of advance stop line standards\(^9\) which are being implemented at signalised junctions throughout London, an unexpected finding of the share the road campaign was the number of junctions where markings do not conform to the standards, and where this impacts on cyclists safety and enforceability and Boroughs are being asked to address this within their rolling borough roads maintenance programmes.

### Figure 2 Advice/education materials for adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Campaign</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immobilise</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Know</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASL leaflet</td>
<td>City of London police</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hop off pavement</td>
<td>Camden Council</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HGV/cyclist Two sides to every story</td>
<td>TfL</td>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>Out of print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycling and your child</td>
<td>TfL/John Ball primary</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVDs</td>
<td>ROSPA - HGV</td>
<td>ROSAP</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big Bus little bike</td>
<td>Buses</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notting Hill Police</td>
<td>Notting Hill/CTUK</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.cyclesense.net">www.cyclesense.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.rospa.org.uk/roadsafety/advice/cycling/index.htm">www.rospa.org.uk/roadsafety/advice/cycling/index.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.tfl.gov.uk/cycles">www.tfl.gov.uk/cycles</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Various London Borough sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2 Driver Training Opportunities

Discussions have recently been initiated with British School of Motoring to incorporate driver awareness of cyclists into their training processes for new drivers.

Ongoing work with freight, public carriage office and bus drivers is also aimed at assisting drivers of commercial vehicles to understand the needs and requirements of cyclists on the road.

TfL is also beginning a range of activities in Spring 2007 addressed towards London’s drivers. Issues relating to interactions between drivers and cyclists will be fully incorporated into these messages, as were done in the No Know leaflet reminding drivers about ASLs.

### 3.2.3 Cycle Training options

TfL/CCE is actively supporting the development and local delivery of cycle training to meet London’s needs (London Cycle Action Plan commitment Section 6.1). The initial focus has been to build up capacity to train children in line with BikeAbility. There is still more work to be done to ensure that there are sufficient providers competent to meet demand. CCE is examining the scope to introduce adult training as part of company travel plans and Health

---

\(^9\) B2-B5 typical detail drawings London Cycle Design Standards
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and Safety procedures. CCE is also working closely with other TfL businesses and London Boroughs to raise awareness, counter misperceptions and improve behaviour/interactions in line with Mayoral objectives. This work includes the following:

- CCE/LRSU research concerning review of traffic and parking enforcement data. This work is ongoing
- Review of Highway code and proposed revisions
- Development of cycle advanced stop box. Introduction of variations to meet local circumstances, negotiation with DfT, inclusion in the “no Know” leaflet to improve compliance
- Feasibility study/review for cyclist “zebra” crossing
- Review and development of cycling advice in the form of leaflets and/or DVDs
- Review of education/training and other alternatives to enforcement
- Review of London Cycling Facilities to identify patterns and what TfL, motorists, cyclists can/should do to reduce risk to cyclists (and compare with New York and Paris)

CCE, TPED and the Metropolitan police are in discussion about the potential usefulness of forms of education through training, and the logistics of using training options on cyclists and motorists in future operations.

The officers involved in BikeSafe are also being consulted to assess the feasibility of applying that model of training provided for motorcyclists and more recently “ScooterSafe”\(^ {10}\). 8,000 motorcyclists have been trained under this scheme, although the training is not considered to be a case disposal option as an alternative after an offence has been committed.

### Figure 3 Ongoing related campaigns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Aim/Focus</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>More info</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists/motorists</td>
<td>Awareness, law</td>
<td>Share the Road</td>
<td>TPED</td>
<td>09.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists</td>
<td>Pavement riding, light</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jumping, safety,</td>
<td>Notting Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positioning</td>
<td>police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists</td>
<td>Safety, law</td>
<td>Atrium</td>
<td>City Police</td>
<td>11.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w/o due care offences</td>
<td>Driver Improvement</td>
<td>Ian Brookes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers/motorcyclists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powered two wheelers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supplement to CBT</td>
<td>Ian Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists</td>
<td>Confidence, positioning</td>
<td>Bike safe/Scooter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner drivers</td>
<td>Equip to pass driving</td>
<td>safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus drivers</td>
<td>Improve performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) [http://www.bikesafe-london.co.uk/](http://www.bikesafe-london.co.uk/) & [http://www.scootersafe-london.co.uk/](http://www.scootersafe-london.co.uk/)
3.3 Share the Road campaign enforcement activity

The aim of the police operations as conducted for this campaign were to provide a media focus for the campaign and also to ensure that the messages of Share the Road regarding illegal activity were backed up by police education and enforcement.

TfL’s Transport Policing and Enforcement Directorate (TPED) reviewed the fixed penalty offences, scope and local priorities and canvassed availability of MPS Transport Operational Command Unit (TOCU) cycle teams. TfL’s Cycling Centre of Excellence compiled a list of suitable sites for enforcement and canvassed Local Authority borough parking attendants.

These pilot operations were aimed at assessing, identifying and taking enforcement action against errant road users within key target locations. Detailed location maps are shown in the following figures.

Responsibility for operational discretion and control of the operational sites fell to the MPS. The MPS provided management of the vehicle/cycle stop site(s) to ensure security and safety. MPS and TfL ensured that all staff are aware of risks and control measures at the sites. In addition, MPS resources continued to operate in their day-to-day functions, as they could not be confined to just the offences outlined below.

Operational resources comprised of one MPS TOCU cycle team and Local Authority Parking Attendants, and actual officer numbers varied by location.

Figure 4 Enforcement operation in Ealing
Figure 5 Enforcement in Islington

Figure 6 Enforcement in Southwark

Figure 7 Enforcement in Westminster

CCE and TPED undertook a review of offences, penalties and enforcement options relating to cycling (see Appendix 2). Officers were asked to focus on the following issues during the
enforcement operations, although this list does not exclude any other offences which may have been observed.

**Motor Vehicles**

- Not stopping at the first white line, or stopping in a cyclist advanced stop box
- Driving or parking in a cycle lane or cycle facility
- Driving in a dangerous, careless or inconsiderate manner
- Using a hand-held mobile phone, or similar device, while driving.
- Not obeying all traffic light signals, road markings and traffic signs giving orders, including temporary signals & signs

**Pedal Cycles**

- Riding a pedal cycle with defective brakes
- Not using front and rear lights at night
- Cycling on a pavement / footway
- Riding where prohibited
- Riding in a dangerous, careless or inconsiderate manner
- Using a hand-held mobile phone, or similar device, when riding.
- Not obeying all traffic light signals, road markings and traffic signs giving orders, including temporary signals & signs
3.4 Share the Road operational statistics

Figure 8 Results from the enforcement campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number people stopped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All modes for the duration of the campaign – i.e. resulted in anything from verbal advice/warning, information pack given, and/or fixed penalty notice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal warnings issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles stopped for using dedicated cycling lanes or jumping red lights (including cyclist advanced stop box infringements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars stopped for jumping red lights (including cyclist advanced stop box infringements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists stopped for red light jumping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists stopped for pavement cycling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed penalty notices issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number FPNs issued for duration of the campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPNs issued to all motor vehicles for failing to stop at red lights (Including cyclist advanced stop box infringements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPN issued to cyclists for failing to stop at red light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPNs issued to cyclists for cycling on a footway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anecdotal evidence from officers working on the campaign identified very few protests from cyclists and pedestrians were particularly supportive of the enforcement action.

There was variation in the reporting procedures followed by each enforcement operation and it will be necessary in future campaigns to ensure consistency across enforced locations and across different TOCU teams. For further information, the specific details of activity at one of the enforcement operations headed by an experienced officer is summarised below:

Friday 22nd Sept Kensington and Chelsea : 7am-7pm

Operations comprised of 5 police officers and 5 TPCSOs, 8 of whom were on bikes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number people stopped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All modes for the duration of the campaign – i.e. resulted in anything from verbal advice/warning, information pack given, and/or fixed penalty notice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.30am to 11am junction of Hammersmith Road &amp; North End Road heading East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles stopped for using dedicated cycling lanes or jumping red lights (including cyclist advanced stop box infringements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars stopped for jumping red lights (including cyclist advanced stop box infringements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists stopped for red light jumping or pavement cycling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The information packs (Appendix 1) were well received and the officers considered that everyone, following their words of advice was better educated.

### 3.5 Other related enforcement activities

#### 3.5.1 London Borough of Westminster

An enforcement campaign was run by Charing Cross police in association with the City of Westminster in Spring 2006 to tackle pavement cycling on the Strand, the North Terrace of Trafalgar Square, Charing Cross Road and approach roads to Covent Garden.

The city council report that the campaign was successful in reducing the incidence of pavement cycling in these areas. A review of traffic orders for Leicester Square has recently been undertaken and will be enforced against cyclists later this month (Nov/Dec 2006).

#### 3.5.2 City of London

Operation Atrium was conducted by the City of London Police Road Policing Unit, the Corporation of London Road safety Team and involved all uniformed officers within the City between 21st Nov and 2nd Dec 2005. This covers an area of only 1 square mile as compared to other police operations including TOCU which are pan-London. The aim of the City of London police operation was "zero tolerance" within this period for cyclists committing offences on pedal cycles. Any cyclists receiving a fixed penalty notice was given the opportunity to attend a road safety talk and video presentation where they were given the chance for their ticket to be cancelled if they attended within 7 days.

- 553 cyclists stopped in City
- 203 FPNs issued
- 2 arrests
- 21 cautions

125 attended City of London Road Safety Road Show “Cycle safe” and had tickets cancelled. One offender attended on 2 consecutive days, and on day 2 her ticket/voucher tendered was not accepted as per voucher details.

#### 3.5.3 Notting Hill Safer Neighbourhood operations at Holland Park

At the same time as the “Share the Road” TOCU operation, a campaign was launched by Notting Hill Metropolitan Police Safer Neighbourhoods team targeted specifically at previously identified issues of pavement cycling and red light jumping by cyclists in the Holland Park area. Data from their operations is provided below.
Figure 9 Notting Hill safer neighbourhoods data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists stopped for red light jumping (majority resulted in verbal warnings rather than FPNs)</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists stopped for pavement cycling</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These cyclists were offered the option of viewing a training DVD there and then, which has been developed by the Notting Hill police officers in collaboration with Cycle Training Organisation CTUK. If they declined, they were issued with a £30 FPN.

CCE and MPS have reviewed the DVD produced by this Safer Neighbourhoods team and discussions are underway to outline options and feasibility of employing a similar approach for general use pan London.

3.6 Stakeholder comments

- Could training be offered in place of penalties? (Adam Coffman, CTC). Stakeholders were advised that cost and logistics of training option was not easy to resolve. Discussions are underway with TPED, Metropolitan police officers from TOCU and Safer Neighbourhoods teams to assess options for future enforcement.
- The issue of cyclist offending should be considered alongside issues of unsafe/unfriendly highway design. (Simon Brammer, LCC). Stakeholders were advised that there is no evidence available to discuss this further. TfL may be able to research this issue in a possible study as part of TRL review.
Section 4. Press Impact

Cycling has an image problem and there is a growing conflict between road users in the capital with cyclists being cast as “Pavement pariahs” (Evening Standard 24 March 2006). Because of this minority of cyclists who break the law by cycling through red lights and riding on pavements, the media and some motorists are expressing anger towards all cyclists. Though most people see cycling as a positive thing, they have a negative image of cyclists. For example cyclists feel moving ahead of traffic makes them safer as they can be seen. TfL therefore is installing advanced stop lines (ASLs) at traffic lights. However, motorist encroachment at ASLs is also very high, which annoys and can endanger cyclists.

The current situation, which is fuelled by certain parts of the media, is leading to animosity between cyclists and motorists with an “us and them” culture developing. This has the potential to have a negative impact on the growth in cycling, the worst case scenario being open aggression between motorists and cyclists.

Transport for London feels that it is necessary to act to address this issue through “Share the Road” to recognise all road users’ right to the road space and to engender respect and consideration towards other road users.

4.1 Media Considerations

- Campaign could be cast as too little too late
- Cyclists already feel victimised, particularly by the media
- Motorists have a low opinion of all cyclists, though only a minority of cyclists act outside the law
- A campaign lasting a month could be seen as a sticking plaster on a growing problem
- The Mayor expressed an interest in cycle registration, is this not just a weak compromise?
- What is such a short-term campaign going to achieve, won’t cyclists just return to their old ways?
- Why now? Surely the number of cyclists is dropping at this time of year
- All stakeholders need to be agreed on key messages, or the media will cast this as a battle between the motorist and cyclists

4.2 Media Strategy

The strategy will seek to achieve three aims:

1) To stimulate a balanced debate in the media about the behaviour of all road users and what they can all do to make London’s streets safer
2) Begin to develop a change in attitudes and behaviour both of cyclists and also towards cyclists by other road users to develop mutual awareness, consideration and respect
3) Demonstrate that TfL is taking action on a number of fronts to tackle this issue in partnership with stakeholders.
4.3 Implementation

The campaign was launched at a site in London where a problem has been identified with motorists stopping in advanced stop lines and cyclists jumping red lights, but not one of those locations which was enforced during the police campaign. Three representatives from a cycling group, a motoring group and a pedestrian group were at the site to offer their endorsement along with a representative from TfL. This was carried out at 8am on the morning of 4th Sept 2006 to ensure high levels of cyclists.

Broadcast media were given the opportunity to film both motorists and cyclists breaking the law, the opportunity to vox pop motorists, cyclists and pedestrians and to seek the views of representatives of the cycling and motoring communities. This opportunity was offered to the media as without it they would have filmed at a site of their choice but without TfL or balanced third party comment.

An operational note was sent out on the day prior to the launch with a press release following on the day of the launch. Spokespeople from TfL, cycling groups and motoring groups were asked to be available throughout the day.

TfL was aware that the announcement of the campaign was likely to result in debate in the media. This is a subject which the media show an interest in and are always keen to report on conflict.

A press release was distributed on 16 September to remind news desks that the special targeted police enforcement activity commenced on 18 September. Media were offered the opportunity to attend enforcement activity at one of the sites on the understanding that they did not reveal the exact location of the enforcement.

This campaign should be considered as a pilot to inform future marketing campaigns and a view on whether the share the road campaign should be continued as a stand-alone TfL campaign or incorporated into other TfL and stakeholder activity. From a long term view point without continued marketing and/or enforcement activity it is difficult to see how a medium to long-term media campaign could be supported.

Target Media

London regional broadcast and print media. London local media, in particular in areas where enforcement activity will take place (on the understanding that locations would not be disclosed). Comment writers to stimulate debate about the issues. Cycling media, to raise the issue within the cycling community. Motoring media, again to raise the debate.


Target Audiences

All road users, motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. Potential cyclists.

4.4 Key Messages

- We all have an equal right to the road space whether on two wheels or four
- Cycling & cyclists benefit everybody in London by reducing congestion & maximising the city’s road capacity

- Jumping red lights and riding on pavements is not only illegal it reinforces negative attitudes about cycling

- Advance stop lines and cycle lanes are for cyclists’ safety—look out for cyclists when driving and give them lots of room

- HGV & cyclists need to both take special care – this message will be factored in

- Share the road, we’ll all get along better & make London’s street safer

**Third party endorsement**

In a campaign of this nature third party endorsement is vital. It is important that stakeholders are briefed about the messages for the campaign and reinforce the message that this campaign is about promoting understanding between all road users and not a means for focusing on the behaviour of one group. Cyclist, motorist, motorcyclist, bus, taxi, freight and pedestrian organisations have all been invited to contribute to the development of this campaign. It is important that these groups acknowledge that all road users will benefit from being more considerate to one another so everyone’s travel can be a safe and pleasant experience.

**4.5 Media Outcomes**

TfL and the Mayor of London’s Press Offices worked to communicate to the various media organisations that the message of the campaign is focused on all road users. As anticipated, the media coverage was focused towards cyclist behaviour, however, all of the coverage made it clear overall that the campaign was focused towards all road users.

The majority of the media coverage began with a focus on cyclists but developed into a balanced focus on all road users overall. The initial focus on cyclists could be a reflection of views from the public and media which demonstrates the need to extend the campaign further, especially as the main message around the importance of all road users sharing the road has also been highlighted by the media.

For example, the ‘Blitz on Selfish Cyclists’ article published by the London Lite paper dated 19th September 2006 is quite an aggressive front page headline. However, when the story continues onto page 4 the sub headline ‘Police target rogue riders and drivers’ is a more balanced and unbiased approach.

Another article printed by the Evening Standard on day 2 of the campaign showed results from the London Metropolitan Police’s work on the first day of the campaign in Islington highlighted that the majority of offences on the road was being committed by taxi and lorry drivers rather than cyclists.

In contrast, Matt Seaton who wrote ‘Bikes are not above the law’ on Comment is Free on the Guardian website, dated 7th September 2006, acknowledges the “responsibility” that cyclists have on the road and encourages cyclists to support the campaign, rather than adopt a blame culture of who is at fault for dangerous roads, especially when so much is “being spent on infrastructure like bike lanes, advance stop lines, routes and parking facilities to promote cycling and make it safer.”

---

NB pedestrian behaviour is not regulated.
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The press coverage would recommend the campaign continue. In general the articles are not biased towards any particular road users and even when they do show any unbalance the overall message is support for the campaign.

On 19 and 20 September, journalists from London Lite and the Evening Standard were invited to witness the enforcement activity aspects of the Share the Road campaign. Coverage ran in London Lite on 19 September and in the Evening Standard on 20 September.

Below is a summary of the Share the Road media coverage on the day the campaign was launched to the media.

**BBC London TV**

**Morning News bulletins:**

Trailed the launch during all morning broadcasts. This initially mentioned cycling but became more balanced as the bulletins progressed.

**Lunchtime News Bulletin:**

Had a feature on the campaign. It communicated messages about Share the Road but focused on cycling with a report about a woman who had been knocked down twice by a cyclist whilst on the pavement.

**18.30 News Broadcast:**

Parts of the programme were dedicated to cycling. A report shown at lunch time was included about cycle training and two studio debates. The first section of the programme was focused on cycling. However, the second section of the broadcast was far more balanced with stakeholder groups all communicating that the campaign is about all road users. It also included a positive feature on cycle training.

**22.30 News Broadcast:**

There was a feature on the campaign, which communicated messages about Share the Road but focused on cycling with a report about woman who had been knocked down twice by a cyclist on a pavement. (similar to lunch time news bulletin).

**BBC Online:**

http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/5312146.stm

**BBC London radio:**

Took interviews from Jenny Jones, IAM, LCC and Living Streets, all communicated the message about the campaign being focused on all road users.

**LBC Radio:**

Also took interview with Jenny Jones

**Time FM:**
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Took interview with Jenny Jones

**Evening Standard (late edition 4 Sept):**

*Headline and opening paragraphs focused on cycling. Later paragraphs were more balanced.*

**Morning Star (5 Sept):**

*Balanced coverage towards all road users*

### 4.6 Stakeholder comments

- The TfL press office were naïve to think that the coverage would be balanced and cyclist group’s fear that the media would focus on cyclist behaviour was played out. (Adam Coffman, CTC). TfL suggested that the copy of the articles were balanced even if some of the headlines were sensational.

- Felt copy was balanced but coverage did not include pedestrian issues adequately. Pre-recorded balanced comments were not broadcast and the TV slot by BBC London on 18.08.06 (before the Share the Road media campaign) was more anti-cycling than anticipated, although BBC Radio interview on the same day did present balanced views. (Simon Barnett, Living Streets). Managing this balance of reporting will continue to be a focus of future campaign phases.
Section 5. Other responses to the campaign

5.1 Responses from members of the public

Taking the overall GLA/TfL “postbag” for September, October and to middle of November 2006 25% mentioned the Share the Road Campaign. These tend to be polarised, calling for enforcement operations aimed at motorists, critiquing enforcement for cyclist offences, complaining about cyclist’s illegal anti-social behaviour and lack of action to address this.

Selection of quotes include

“…I firmly believe that if the Mayor (who I totally support) wants to stop cyclists using the pavement he can help the reasonable majority by stopping all parking bays in cycle lanes and ensuring that road layouts at traffic lights are modified to allow the cyclists a continuous lane (as they have at the bus lanes)…”

“The authorities are always keen on prosecuting cyclists, but ignore the far greater levels of abuse by pedestrians and motorists.”

“I’ve seen loads of road safety adverts on TV over the years trying to show the effect a car has when it hits a motorbike or a pedestrian or a cyclist. I have never seen an advert showing the effect a bike has on a pedestrian.”

“Please add the laws for PEDESTRIANS to the “Share the Road” campaign. Walking through "no walk" signs and crossing the middle of roads rather than crosswalks are adding to the overall traffic density and stress for all road-users”

“I am greatly concerned by the amount of cyclists who totally ignore red lights - I have experienced several near misses when using pedestrian crossings....... Please continue with your campaign to make cyclists have number plates and also take out accident insurance similar to car insurance.”

‘...Why are cyclists who disobey the laws of road ignored? If as a car driver I drove through red lights, performed illegal turns or drove on the wrong side of the road etc., I would be arrested and quite right too and if I drove down the pavement . . . my insane actions would probably be mentioned on the local TV and newspapers. So why are cyclists not treated the same? I’ve been in situations where these types of incidents happen and there is a police car or policeman there and they just ignore the offending cyclist.”

“I object strongly to your recent advert "Make room for cyclists". The Londoner November 2006.. cyclists (of which I am one, pay no road tax) and do not carry mandatory insurance, so I query the view that they have a right to the road: They have a right if they obey the rules of the road…”

“Whilst reading through our local paper THE POST (wed Sept 2006) with regards to the above subject, I am amazed how cyclists have the equal right to the road when for one they dont pay road tax or any form of insurance. What happens if one hits my car?? How about the use of the tarmac, the wear and tear of the roads??

Whos going to fund the maintenance of these cyclists lanes?? Im all for the cyclists to be on the roads its environmentally friendly, however should’nt they show some sort of responsibility to us as drivers of cars because we have rights as well and it would be nice to feel that we are protected too from the cyclists…..When they are on the road WHY do they not get caught on camera when the jump a red light?? WHY do they think they can ride on the pavements and not get caught, see a car or van drive on a pavement and we are immediatly given a penalty. Basically cyclist do not obey road signs like all drivers and we get penalised when we do wrong. So in effect they do not have an equal right to the road, they have a priority.”
5.2 Press statements from stakeholders


In conjunction with CTC - The UK’s national cyclists’ organisation, Sustrans, Living Streets, Transport 2000 and the Environmental Transport Association, London Cycling Campaign has prepared the following joint statement on Transport for London’s ‘Share the Road’ campaign launched Tuesday 4th September 2006 by Mayor Ken Livingstone.

*Pedestrian and cycle user groups are responding to Transport for London’s “Share the Road” campaign by calling on all road users to behave more considerately and to respect each other’s equal rights to use the road.*

*In particular, drivers, motorcyclists and cyclists are being encouraged to be more considerate to vulnerable road users like pedestrians and children.*

*Most road users whether drivers, cyclists or pedestrians behave responsibly and this needs to be encouraged to create the safer road conditions where walking and cycling can flourish. All Londoners stand to gain from this thanks to the reduction in congestion and pollution, as well as improved opportunities to travel in ways which are healthy, convenient, enjoyable and affordable.*

*Pedestrian and cycle user groups, in common with other road user organisations, advocate responsible cycling, driving and motorcycling, and this includes observation of traffic regulations by all road users. Pedestrian and cycle user groups believe that greater police enforcement is needed for all road traffic offences including those which most endanger life and limb such as speeding, drink driving and illegal mobile phone use.*

*Pedestrian and cycle user groups are promoting cycle training as a way of enabling new cyclists to gain the confidence to cycle on city roads. In London, cycle user groups are also distributing cycle route maps which allow new cyclists to choose the routes that best suit their ability.*

- **CTC the national cyclists’ organisation**
- **Living Streets (formerly the Pedestrians Association)**
- **London Cycling Campaign**
- **Sustrans**
- **Environmental Transport Association**
- **Transport 2000**

*Notes * ASL - Advance Stop Line - Separate box painted on the ground at traffic lights, with cycle symbol inside, designed to improve cyclist safety. Under traffic regulations it is an offence for a motor vehicle (including motorcycles and scooters) to enter an ASL when the light is red.*

[Click here for the Mayor's press release on the Share the Road campaign](http://www.lcc.org.uk/index.asp?PageID=1080)

For press enquiries please contact LCC offices on 020 7234 9310
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'Share the Road' Campaign is Based on Myths, not Facts

Transport for London’s (TfL) month-long 'Share the Road' campaign, launched yesterday to encourage road users to show mutual respect, is based on myths rather than facts about the risks about the dangers posed by errant drivers and cyclists respectively, according to CTC, the national cyclists’ organisation.

Figures covering the years 2001-05, provided to CTC by TfL (on the day that "Share the Road" was launched), show that a pedestrian in London is over 100 times more likely to be injured in collision with a motor vehicle than a cycle. During that period there has been no upward trend in the number of London pedestrians being injured in collision with cycles, despite a 72% increase in cycle use on London’s main roads.

The figures show that, in London during the period 2001-05:

- There were 101 times as many reported pedestrian injuries due to collisions with motor vehicles than with pedal cycles (there were 34,791 pedestrian injuries involving motor vehicles, compared with 331 involving cycles).
- Motor vehicles were involved in 126 times as many fatal and serious pedestrian injuries as cycles (there were 7,447 fatal and serious injuries involving motor vehicles compared with 59 involving cycles).
- 534 pedestrians were killed in collisions with motor vehicles, compared with just one killed in collision with a cycle. That one fatal collision with a cycle occurred neither on a pavement nor a pedestrian crossing point.
- Even on the pavement, there were 2,197 reported pedestrian injuries arising from collisions with motor vehicles, including 17 fatalities. These injuries outnumbered those involving cycles by a factor of 42 to 1.
- The total number of reported pedestrian injuries in London due to collisions with cyclists on pavements was just 65 in the year 2001, and 69 in 2005. In the meantime, the figure went down, up and back down again, showing no clear overall trend. This was despite a 72% increase in cycle use over the period.
- On average just under 18% of cyclists ran red lights, whereas over a third of motorists encroached into cyclists’ “Advance Stop Lines” (cycle boxes at traffic lights).

CTC supports the principle of sharing the road and agrees that all road users, drivers and cyclists alike, have a duty to show respect for the rules of the road and one another’s safety. Moreover, CTC would wholeheartedly welcome a substantial increase in resources for road traffic policing, since cyclists (together with pedestrians) are far more likely to be the victims rather than perpetrators of dangerous behaviour on the roads.

However, CTC is concerned that TfL’s media campaign has focused on red light jumping and drivers’ violation of advance stop lines (ASL’s). CTC in no way endorses endorsing law-breaking by cyclists, however the reasons for their actions (e.g. the much greater dangers they themselves experience at the hands of lawless drivers) need to be recognised and acted upon if ”Share the Road” is to achieve its stated objectives. A campaign which merely generates “lycra-lout” headlines is unlikely to be heeded; instead it merely reinforces entrenched attitudes, not only among the minority of law-breaking cyclists, but also the thoroughly anti-social minority of drivers who think that any cyclist (law-abiding or otherwise) is fair game for a bit of aggression. Both these factors are likely to undermine (rather than support) Ken Livingston's commendable efforts to increase cycle use in London.

CTC Campaigns and Policy Manager Roger Geffen said:

“We are happy to support the principles of all road users and showing respect for one another and obeying the law. However, Transport for London’s campaign is simply a headline-grabbing initiative – it is not a serious attempt to tackle the road safety issues which most need addressing, such as speeding, driving under the influence, and the equally serious offence of using a mobile phone while driving. Tackling these issues will require not just a PR campaign, but some real effort at traffic law enforcement, targeted primarily at those activities which most endanger life and limb. TfL’s campaign also needs to incorporate the provision of quality cycle training for people of all ages, to encourage them to cycle and to give them the confidence and skills to use the roads safely and responsibly.”

Transport for London has also released some data about fatalities in London arising from red light jumping in the last 5 years (2001-2005). These show that, during that period, 2 cyclists were killed in London while jumping red lights. However, during the same time-period:
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• 7 motorbikers died jumping red lights (one of these collisions also killed a car driver);
• 3 cyclists were killed by drivers jumping red lights;
• 7 pedestrians were killed by drivers jumping red lights;
• 7 people (drivers or passengers) were killed in collisions between two motor vehicles (excluding motorbikes).

Jumping a red light on a bike is irresponsible and can be dangerous. Jumping a red light on any other kind of vehicle is a lot more irresponsible and dangerous. Far more motorbikers than cyclists get killed jumping red lights. Drivers endanger other people's lives (especially pedestrians and cyclists) – whereas cyclists very rarely endanger anyone else's lives but their own.

CTC argues that this kind of message now needs to be built into TfL’s “Share the Road”, to ensure that the resulting media coverage is suitably balanced. We are also calling for more resources should be allocated to road traffic policing, and that the this should be focused primarily on those activities which most endanger life and limb, such as speeding, drink and drug driving, and using a mobile phone while driving. The campaign should also incorporate the provision of good cycle training for people of all ages, including those caught riding on the pavement. Many cyclists – especially teenagers – have never had the training needed to use London’s busy roads confidently, safely and legally in the first place.

See also a joint statement on Share the Road from several walking, cycling and sustainable transport interest groups.

IAM BACKS BID BY LONDON MAYOR TO "SHARE THE ROAD"


Motorists, cyclists and pedestrians in London are all being encouraged to Share the Road - the title of a new and ongoing Transport for London (TfL) campaign, launched by the Mayor of London today (4 September 2006) and supported by the IAM (Institute of Advanced Motorists).

The Mayor wants to encourage all road users to stick to the rules of the road and to consider the impact of their behaviour on other people. The first stage of the campaign comprises a month long advertising and enforcement campaign.

A visible minority of road users break traffic laws in London, including vehicles parking in cycle lanes and encroaching into the ‘advance stop’ boxes designated for cyclists, as well as some cyclists who endanger themselves and pedestrians by jumping red lights and riding on the pavement. The actions of a few can cause animosity between road users, are inconsiderate and can endanger lives.

The campaign is supported by a wide range of road user organisations including London Cycle Campaign (LCC), the Institute of Advanced Motorists (IAM), Living Streets, the Motorcycle Industry Association and the Freight Transport Association.

Ken Livingstone, Mayor of London, said:

"Overall London’s roads are getting safer. But there is nothing more frustrating, and often dangerous, than road users who think the rules do not apply to them. I want to see a shift in the culture on our roads where inconsiderate behaviour by the minority is increasingly treated as unacceptable. The only way all road users can get about safely and fairly is everyone obeys the rules of the road equally.
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Everyone must share the road, whether it is motorists who park on cycle lanes and occupy the 'advance stop' box reserved for cyclists, or cyclists who think it is OK to jump red lights. All of these activities are inconsiderate at best and dangerous at worst. The vast majority follow the rules, but there is a small and visible minority who are irresponsible and risk everyone else's safety. This awareness campaign, which starts today, encourages everyone to obey the rules of the road and spells out the consequences of not doing so. This will be followed by targeted police enforcement to catch those road users who still think the rules of the road are there to be ignored.

"As we build on the road safety successes in the capital and the growing enthusiasm for cycling, everyone on the busy streets needs to be considerate towards each other and to give each other room."

IAM Chief Examiner Peter Rodger said:

"The IAM supports this campaign to encourage all road users to cooperate and look out for each other. London's roads are crowded - we can behave like caged rats and fight with each other for space, or we can behave like human beings and cooperate with each other. If we simply give each other a bit of room, it all works better.

"Crashes also cause congestion. Even a minor shunt creates a bottleneck at peak times - and that just adds to the pressure. Motorists have a key role to play in preventing those crashes. Drivers can become frustrated by the actions of some cyclists and pedestrians, but the onus is still on the motorist to drive with care and remember the vulnerability of other road users."

Research for Transport for London, by the independent Transport Research Laboratory (TRL), showed that in London one in five cyclists jumped a red light and that motorists stopped in more than a third of advance stop boxes, both of which are against the law. Road casualty figures from 2005 show that eight people were killed and 201 people were seriously injured after a vehicle failed to stop at a red light.

The police enforcement campaign will focus on five sites across London and will tackle road users who break the rules of the road, either by advising of infringements or giving a fixed penalty notice.

ENDS

Notes to editors:

- Electronic copies of the Share the Road press ads are available on request

- The number of people killed or seriously injured on London’s roads has fallen by 45 per cent compared with the government’s baseline from the mid to late 1990s

- The number of cyclists on London’s major roads has increased by 72 per cent since 2000

Contact details for GLA: For further information please contact Hilary Merrett on 020 7983 4753.

For out of hours media enquiries please call 020 7983 4000

For non-media enquiries please call the Public Liaison Unit on 020 7983 4100.

Contact details for IAM:
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For further information please contact Vince Yearley on 020 8996 9600. We have an ISDN line for interviews.

For out of hours media enquiries please call 020 8996 9600 and follow the recorded message details.

BSM: Motorists and Cyclists - Sharing the Road together
“We can work together to determine how the BSM Mind Alertness Product (MAP) could be adapted for both Cyclists and Motorists to use, to improve their understanding of each other and help them look out for each other.”
Mykay Kamara
BSM Managing Director
“In recent interviews I have been emphasising the need for motorists to treat cyclists, being vulnerable road users, with respect for which the quid pro quo should be that cyclists will not do the unexpected such as jump red lights or ride the wrong way up one way streets. If we can work together to emphasise the need for respect between all road users, I would be delighted….in principle we would be very pleased to back this [Share the Road Campaign] as it is very close to the position we have been taking. .”

Sheila Rainger
Campaigns Manager
RAC Foundation

Feedback stated that “the 'Share the Road Campaign' looked promising in respect to raising awareness of cyclists on the road and for cyclists to be aware of other road user(s).”

Hugh Brennan
Principal Transport Planner,
LB Westminster

5.3 Stakeholder comments (GLA meeting 13.10.06)

- What did each organisation do during the campaign?
- Has the view of the organisation on the campaign changed?
- What should happen next?

GLA Green Party – After six years of constant issues being raised it is good that there is a campaign, albeit that it needs to develop and maintain balanced approach.

Public Carriage Office (PCO) – Feels there has been a general improvement in behaviour after the campaign. A better co-ordination of materials (leaflets, press releases) could reduce opportunities for divisive media stories.

Transport 2000 – Would want to see better press co-ordination with other groups in the next phase and that the campaign should extend to other/all road users. Suggest focusing activities on workplaces acknowledging that we are looking in the main at commuting.

David Love – Expected a ‘hearts and minds’ campaign through stakeholder groups. An overarching brand for Share the Road could be used as an umbrella for stakeholder group actions and campaigning across more road users. TfL should perhaps stick to enforcement and press activity.

Institute of Advanced Motorists – Supportive of campaign and attended the launch event. Wish to stay involved and pleased with progress so far.

Sustrans – Still supportive of the concept. Suggested that there needs to be more monitoring of impacts and attitudes as the campaign is still essentially experimental.

Road Peace – Supportive of the campaign. Suggested the need to move forward by including more modes, particularly pedestrians who are most vulnerable to injury from selfish/reckless behaviour.

Living Streets – The approach so far has been sensible but the campaign should also move onto effects on pedestrian. They were interviewed for the campaign and remained supportive and balanced although considered that reporting was unfair.
London Cycling Campaign – Enthusiastic that there is a multi-modal group involved in the campaign steering group. Opportunities to make more use of LCC and other groups to increase coherence, but to do so requires more lead-in time for consultation. Campaign should move into the next phase looking broader, at relative vulnerability and focusing on road dangers. Acknowledged that there are some confusing messages around some behaviours, especially pavement cycling when this is legal in some places. (nb. Met Police observed that in the enforcement operation most pavement cyclists were not UK nationals)

CTC national cyclists organisation – retain serious reservations as expressed in CTC press releases. Feel that the campaign should not be based on PR but on relative threats, safety education/training and dealing with those threats. Still supportive of the concept and enforcement activity around the campaign but not the current execution. Want TfL to do more with Police on enforcing traffic laws.

Head of CCE (Rose Ades) – Felt that the campaign should be considered in a wider context. There is a need for co-ordination between representative groups to improve cohesiveness of message but press need hooks which TfL can help provide through campaign materials. The fact that the Mayor supports the campaign must be seen as a benefit.

Motorcycle Industry Association – Surprised at low number of PTW advance stop box offences in the Police operations. Agree with more enforcement on Share the Road basis. Agree with focus on relative vulnerability. Doesn’t think there has been a great deal of change in the street. Able and willing to promote campaign next time.

Freight Transport Association – Supportive and very aware of conflicts between HGV and cyclists, and the tragic results. Happy to offer media channels, if vulnerability and safety advice increased in future.

LRSU (Janet Kirrage) – Clear that more consultation required with stakeholders on future campaigns. Monitoring is also essential to detect changes, strengths and weaknesses of approach and the campaign should include pedestrians in relation to casualty targets. As engineering options reduce, ‘hearts and minds’ approaches need to increase for road safety purposes. Would like to contribute to Police leaflet and to work further on HGV/cyclist issues (building on existing LRSU work)

GLA Transport (Becky Upfold) – Reported that RAC (who were not attending) were supportive of the campaign and so do not see the need to intervene in discussions. Also reported that the AA happy to see campaign develop as it has done so far.
5.4 London Local Authority Cycling officers feedback

Do more

- More campaigns like this are required
- Increasing drivers awareness of cyclists
- Stopping cyclists & motorists at the same enforcement locations
- Good strap lines & bold easy to see titles

Stop Doing

- Giving general press another excuse to slag off cyclists
- Clothing cyclists in hi-vis & helmets so suggesting it is a dangerous & abnormal activity
- Use better images for marketing, pictures are unrealistic
- Don’t target cyclists.

Do differently

- Road danger approach – who causes danger to other road users
- Only enforce cyclist red light jumping when 4 KSIs are attributable to it over 3 years (as per speed cameras)
- Target motorists more as they kill and cyclists don’t
- Select junctions with busy pedestrians crossing & more than one cyclists at the cycle advanced stop box
- Use advert when red-light jumping cyclists is then knocked down by emerging vehicle as deterrent
- Focus on simple message of “Share the Road” or “If in doubt, slow down”

Start doing

- Police to stop drivers intimidating/endangering cyclists – this is more important than cycle advanced stop box infringement
- Offer free NS cycle training London-wide, mention cycle training to increase confidence
- Target motorists not vulnerable road users, focus on speeding & aggressive driving
- Explain cyclists rights to be there, attack mythology eg why motorists have not paid a tax for the road
Section 6 Conclusions and next steps

The “Share the Road” campaign conducted in September 06 is a Mayoral commitment, managed by Transport for London (TfL) to catalyse activity that will change anti-social and illegal behaviour by and towards cyclists through engagement with road user organisations. TfL is committed to delivering a campaign to promote mutual respect between cyclists and other road users. The increases in cycling in London observed over the last few years have resulted in a large amount of media interest in the behaviours and dangers that impact on cyclists. Therefore the decision was taken to conduct a marketing, media and enforcement campaign to begin to address this complex issue. The primary goal of raising awareness of the issue was achieved with significant media coverage and attention to the marketing and enforcement campaign. Lessons learned will be taken from the campaign and enforcement operations and next steps agreed with stakeholders for moving the mutual education process for motorists and cyclists onwards.

Key lessons learned

Campaign and media interest requires clear and interlinked components of

- Marketing
- Education
- Enforcement
- Stakeholder engagement

- Education is very effective when channelled by police to the public. Positive feedback from operations and no dis-benefits (eg litter on the streets)
- Research into cycling fatalities and NY initiative suggests strong message to drivers. The campaign and the response to it from motoring organisations such as IAM, RAC and BSM provide good opportunities to develop the campaign further.
- It is important for TfL to engage with commercial vehicles including buses and taxis. ‘TfL’s Freight Operators Recognition Scheme (FORS) provides a good opportunity to raise awareness amongst freight operators of the particular risks associated with HGV v Cycles collisions’. We (collectively) need to work this problem and the linked issues in a joined up way.
- It is necessary to establish a clearer understanding of what can be achieved with this type of campaign and how it is complemented or built on by other CCE and stakeholder activity.
- The outcomes from the enforcement operations suggests that there are significant practical issues still to be resolved. Titus Halliwell and Ian Brooks’ reports suggest that it is possible to continue with these operations if managed by experienced officers.
- Improvements are required to the educational materials, leaflets and DVDs etc. The leaflet issued (Appendix 1) will be modified, re-branded to include Met Police/GLA and TfL logos and format adjusted
- Recommend work with stakeholders etc to produce a single leaflet for public/road users which covers “Share the Road”, looking out for other people on pavements, as well as possible traffic and parking issues.
- TfL needs to communicate what it is doing and deliver evidence around cycling, safety and enforcement to counter misconceptions and polarised attitudes. It would be useful to tie in with plans for camera enforced 20mph zones.
- This has been a new venture for all concerned. Future similar projects would benefit from a “project board” and stronger client in RNP
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Appendix 1: Leaflet handed out to offenders during TOCU enforcement campaign

Transport for London and Metropolitan Police Transport OCU

Share the Road Campaign THINK! Drive safe. Cycle safe.

Motorists and cyclists both have a right to use Britain's roads - a right to safe and enjoyable travel. Both share a responsibility to understand each other's needs - and to respond positively. This leaflet aims to make motorists and cyclists more aware of one another, and to counter the intolerance that can develop between them - in short, to establish a climate of mutual courtesy and care.

What cyclists would like motorists to know:

1. Cyclists are more vulnerable than motorists - drivers have the major responsibility to take care. Rain, wind and poor visibility make conditions worse for cyclists.

2. Cyclists can feel threatened by inconsiderate driving. They have a right to space on the road and need extra room at junctions and roundabouts where cars change speed, position and direction.

3. Cyclists ride away from the kerb, not to annoy motorists but to:
   - Avoid drains, potholes and debris
   - Be seen as they come to junctions with side roads
   - Discourage drivers from squeezing past when it's too narrow.

4. Cyclists turning right are exposed - and need extra consideration from motorists, especially on multi-lane roads with fast-moving traffic.

5. Cyclists can be forced into faster traffic - by vehicles parked in cycle lanes, at junctions or on double yellow lines.

6. Cyclists are dazzled by full beam headlights, like everyone else.

7. Cyclists can be fast movers - 20mph or more.

What motorists can do:

1. Think bike. Expect to see cyclists, and take care.

2. Slow down and drive smoothly. Keep within speed limits. Expect sudden movements by cyclists, especially in windy weather and on bad road surfaces.

   Signal: always at roundabouts every time you pass a cyclist.

   Watch for riders on the inside when you turn left. Don't cut them up.

3. Give cyclists space - at least half a car's width - and never force past them. Be patient - a few seconds for a cyclist hardly affects your total journey time.
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4. Right-turning cyclists need space and time.

5. Park considerately. Always look for cyclists before opening a car door.

6. Use dipped headlights.

7. Expect speed from bikes. Think of a bike as a vehicle - it is.

**What motorists would like cyclists to know;**

1. Motorists get upset if cyclists ride without lights at night, ignore red traffic lights or hop on and off the pavement.

2. Motorists usually travel faster than cyclists and may have less time to take account of hazards.

3. Motorists may not always see cyclists.

4. Motorists are made uneasy when cyclists seem hesitant, move out suddenly or wobble around potholes.

5. Motorists can feel delayed by cyclists.

6. Motorists don't always understand that some road surfaces, junctions or traffic conditions cause problems for cyclists.

**What cyclists can do;**

1. Follow the Highway Code.

**Don’t:**

- Jump red lights.
- Ride on pavements (unless they are shared paths).
- Ride the wrong way in one-way streets (unless signs say that cyclists are permitted to do so).
- Ride across pedestrian crossings.


4. Show drivers what you plan to do. Always look and signal before you start, stop or turn. Ride a straight line past parked cars rather than dodge between them.

5. Move over, when it's safe and convenient. Two-abreast is often OK, but try not to hold up other traffic.

6. Ride positively and decisively. It helps motorists to understand what you plan to do.

*Rules are there to protect you, and others. Just because you are on a bike doesn’t mean you can ignore traffic lights, pedestrian crossings, one-way streets and other road signs! You also have to obey Police Officers, Traffic Wardens and School Crossing Patrols. You must not ride on pavements or footpaths, unless there are signs permitting this. Similarly you can only use bus lanes where you see the symbol of a bicycle displayed. Where there are cycle lanes and cycle tracks provided make use of them. Never ride with more than two of you side by side, and on narrow roads ride single file.*
### Appendix 2 Table of cycle related offences/contraventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Legislation / Regulation</th>
<th>Type of Enforcement Action</th>
<th>Enforcer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riding a pedal cycle with defective brakes</td>
<td>PCUR regs 6 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not using front and rear lights at night and not having an efficient red rear reflector</td>
<td>RVLR no 18 &amp; 24</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not keeping to the side intended for cyclists on a segregated cycle track</td>
<td>HA 1835 sect 72</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying a passenger when the cycle has not been built or adapted to carry</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sect 24 as amended by RTA 1991</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding on to a vehicle in order to be towed or carried</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sect 26 as amended by RTA 1991</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling on a pavement / footway</td>
<td>HA 1835 sect 72</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding where prohibited (including travelling in the wrong direction on a one way street (unless there is a contraflow lane))</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sect 36 &amp; RTRA sects 5 &amp; 8</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding in a dangerous, careless or inconsiderate manner</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sect 28 &amp; 29 as amended by RTA 1991</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Uniformed police officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding under the influence of drink or drugs</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sect 30 as amended by RTA 1991</td>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>Uniformed police officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk in charge of a pedal cycle</td>
<td>LA sect 12</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Uniformed police officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanton or furious riding, wilful misconduct, wilful neglect or do or cause bodily harm to any person.</td>
<td>OAPA sect 35</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Uniformed police officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not obeying all traffic light signals, road markings and traffic signs giving orders, including temporary signals &amp; signs</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sect 36; TSRGD regs 10,15, 16, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 36, 38, 40 &amp; 43; TMA (civil)</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN (criminal) Penality Charge Notice (civil)</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer TIL / Local Authority (civil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not obeying signals or directions given by police officers and traffic wardens and signs used by school crossing patrols</td>
<td>RTA sect 28; RTA 1988 sect 35 and FTWO part 3</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer Traffic Warden TPCSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraverring directions given by a parks constable in a Royal Park.</td>
<td>Reg 5, Park Regulations 1872</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stopping as directed by a police officer</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sect 163</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a hand-held mobile phone, or similar device, when riding</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sects 2 &amp; 3; CUR regs 104 &amp; 110</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercising proper control of cycle at all times.</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sects 2 &amp; 3; CUR regs 104 &amp; 110</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VEHICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Legislation / Regulation</th>
<th>Type of Enforcement Action</th>
<th>Enforcer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving or parking in a cycle lane (criminal) of bus lane (civil)</td>
<td>RTRA sects 5 &amp; 8; TMA (civil)</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN Penalty Charge Notice (civil) Process</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer Traffic Warden TPCSO Parking Attendant (civil) TIL / Local Authority (civil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check before opening door</td>
<td>Reg 105, CUR</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess speed</td>
<td>RTRA sects 81,86,89 &amp; sch 8</td>
<td>Endorseable FPN Process Arrest</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large vehicle parked on footpath or verge</td>
<td>RTRA sects 5 &amp; 8</td>
<td>Non-Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stopping at the second white line, in an advanced stop line area</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sect 36; TSRGD regs 10 &amp; 43(2)</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving in a dangerous, careless or inconsiderate manner</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sects 2 &amp; 3 as amended by RTA 1991</td>
<td>Process Arrest</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving under the influence of drink or drugs</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sects 4, 5 &amp; 11(2)</td>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not obeying all traffic light signals and traffic signs giving orders, including temporary signals &amp; signs</td>
<td>RTA 1988 sect.36; TSRGD regs 10,15, 16, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 36, 38, 40 &amp; 43</td>
<td>Endorseable FPN</td>
<td>Uniformed Police Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 Background information

Surveys assessing scale of cyclist offending

There are a number of surveys which have been carried out in order to assess the actual number of cyclists that commit offences such as red light jumping and pavement cycling. The figures from the most recent available surveys as outlined below, demonstrate a variation from 6% to 50% demonstrating the discrepancy between different methodologies, locations and perception of cyclists behaviour compared to actual data.

**RAC Survey 2003**

The RAC Foundation reported in 2003 a study that they had conducted between 9.30am and noon and between 4pm and 6pm at three separate sites in both Central London and Glasgow. This “snap shot survey” suggested that one in ten car drivers risked a serious accident or injury to themselves, other road users and pedestrians by driving through a traffic light when it had clearly been red for over three seconds while a further two in ten took a chance on a last minute amber signal.

From this survey, cyclists were found to have the least regard for traffic lights, most notably in central London. In Glasgow up to one in four cyclists seemed to have no regard for traffic lights. In central London this figure rose to as high as fifty per cent of all cyclists.

RAC called for national government action to address this issue.

**Positioning and behaviour at Cycle Advance Stop Lines 2002-04**

TfL commissioned TRL to report on positioning and behaviour at cycle advance stop lines of 14 ASL junctions in London. This showed

- 36% of cyclists experienced encroachment into the ASL box while they were using it
- 18% of cyclists jump red lights
- 87% cyclists use near-side feeder lanes
- 52% cyclists use central feeder lanes
- most cyclists do reach ASL boxes whether or not there are feeder lanes
- feeder lanes were blocked for 6% of cyclists

**Advanced Stop Line Variations: research study 2005**

Research carried out on Cyclist Advanced Stop Boxes in 2005 collected data on cycle flows and behaviour at a number of sites in London. The findings suggested that that a range of 7% to 66% of cyclists ignored the red signal at the 10 sites observed (average 39%). If those cyclists that stop beyond the reservoir and thus encroach the stop line are also included in the analysis, an average of 76% of cyclists committed a running red light offence at the locations observed.

**Figure 10 Advanced stop box use by cyclists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Average number of daily cyclists</th>
<th>Number arriving during red signal &amp; %</th>
<th>% that stop in the reservoir</th>
<th>% that stop beyond the reservoir</th>
<th>% that ignore the red signal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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The research also assessed the levels of encroachment of Advanced Stop Boxes by motor vehicles and showed that 68% of vehicles encroach into the box somewhat. This links to the findings in the TRL study (See Section 6.1.2) where 36% cyclists experienced this.

**Figure 11 Cycle advanced stop box use by motorists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of encroachment</th>
<th>Car/Van</th>
<th>HGV/Bus</th>
<th>PTW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 25%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% to 50%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The levels of cycle feeder lane encroachment were generally very low in comparison to ASL infringements.

**Figure 12 Cycle feeder lane encroachment by motorists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of encroachment</th>
<th>Car/Van</th>
<th>HGV/Bus</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No or slight encroachment</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to a third</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than a third (lane effectively blocked)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cyclist conflict was also assessed at each of the 10 sites suing video footage. The conflict assessment technique as loosely based on that used in the TRL conflict study using 5 categories,

- Cyclist discomfort where the cyclists did not brake or change direction but was likely to have felt discomfort perhaps due to the close proximity of another vehicle (21 incidents)
- Minor conflict (cyclist/motorist has to brake or change direction but movement is calm and controlled) (13 incidents)
- Major conflict (cyclist/motorist has to take emergency action in what is considered to be a near miss) (3 incidents)
- Collision (none)
City of London Police Survey 2005

Corporation of London Road Safety Team commissioned a pedal cycle survey which took place 19th Oct to 21st Oct 2005 between 0700-1300hrs. Locations of junctions

- Bishopsgate/Wormwood Street/Camomile Street
- Gracechurch Street/Penchurch Street
- Bank Junction
- Fleet Street/Fetter Lane
- Moorgate/London Wall

Survey data showed that

- 14,523 cyclist maneuvers logged
- 1449 cyclists contravened Red ATS (10%)
- 299 used pavement to bypass the signalized junction (2.1%)
- 1113 stopped at red in front of the stop line (7.7%)

Moorgate had the highest percentage of offenders but only 2615 manoeuvres whereas the Bank Junction had the highest volume with 4305 manoeuvres

They concluded that they would estimate on average 20% of all cyclists disobeyed the Traffic Signals in one form or another, including riding on the pavement to avoid the red signal. This conclusion is a higher estimate than the survey data itself would suggest.

TPED Traffic enforcement Survey 2006

Traffic enforcement arm of TPED surveyed 11 separate camera sites centred on the City of London and central London, over a one month period from mid-May 2006 to mid-June 2006.

The aim of the survey was to attempt to identify the extent of the problem. Within this study, 'jumping' red traffic lights was defined as progressing through the junction (at least a third) or turning into a side road while the traffic light was red. Cyclists edging forward pass the white traffic lights line without actually crossing the junction were not counted, although this is in fact technically an offence. Most sites were monitored for between one and five days, except Rosebery Avenue, which was monitored for eight days.

The table below and graph on the following page shows the results of the surveys. In total 1,400 incidents of light jumping by cyclists were recorded. Generally, incidents occurred most often between 8am – 10am and 5pm – 7pm. The scale of the problem varied across the sites, ranging from a low of 2.2% to a high of 14.3%. The average percentage of cyclists jumping red lights across all the sites in this survey was 6.3%.

Figure 13 Red light violations by cyclists
There are many pieces of legislation that relate to cycling in the UK and different policing authorities are responsible for enforcing traffic offences and maintaining the safety of cycles (and equipment).

**Figure 14 Legal framework of enforcement of issues relating to cyclists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Act or regulation</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functions of Traffic Wardens Order 1970</td>
<td>FTWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Traffic Management Act 2004</td>
<td>TMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Act 1835 or 1980</td>
<td>HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorways Traffic (England and Wales) Regulations 1982</td>
<td>MT (E&amp;W)R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cycles (construction and use) Regulations 1983</td>
<td>PCUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Traffic Act 1988 or 1991</td>
<td>RTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984</td>
<td>RTRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Vehicles Lighting Regulations 1989</td>
<td>RVLR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing Act 1872</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offences Against the Person Act 1861</td>
<td>OAPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Vehicles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1986</td>
<td>CUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signals Regulations and General Directions 2002</td>
<td>TSRGD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the police can enforce Road Traffic Offences that constitute as a criminal offence. However a number of pieces of legislation provide a framework for the decriminalisation of certain offences which provide Local Authorities with the powers to enforce non-endorsable parking offences and some moving traffic offences using cameras in London. Decriminalised enforcement powers allow Local Authorities to take over responsibility for enforcing parking contraventions from the police. It does NOT include the enforcement of endorsable offences and offences related to obstruction.

Cyclist and vehicle drivers have specific statutory (criminal) and common (civil) law duties to fulfil in order to be “a responsible and considerate road user”.

---
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5 policing groups can undertake action for cycle related offences (criminal) and contraventions (civil)

- Police Officers
- Traffic Wardens
- Local Authority Parking Attendants
- Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs)
- Traffic Police Community Support Officers (TPCSOs)

Cameras can also be used to assess contraventions of motorists by using licence plates to identify the registered owner of the vehicle.

Most cycle related offences are enforced by a police officer issuing a Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN), a process report and (in some cases) arrest. Traffic warden police the TLRN and are able to issue FPNs for vehicle “parking” type offences and some moving traffic offences such as stopping in yellow box junctions. Parking attendants are employed by a private enforcement contractor working in partnership with the local authority, and not the police. Parking attendants can only issue Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) for vehicle parking offences only. They are not able to enforce moving traffic offences or direct traffic and Traffic Wardens can.

PCSOs can be designation specific powers by a police constable, which from a cyclists perspective provides PCSOs with the power to issue FPNs for cycling on a footway. TPCSO’s are empowered as Traffic Wardens so they have the additional enforcement powers as Traffic Warden’s as well as PCSO powers.

**Metropolitan police cycling related FPNs and PCNs issued in 2005**

**Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs)**

A total of 2,385 FPNs were issued for cycling related offences in 2005 Over 65% of all FPNs issued were for cycling on the footway. Over 18% of the FPNs were issued to cyclists for contravening automatic traffic signals.

**Figure 15 Fixed Penalty Notices issued to cyclists in 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Type</th>
<th>Number of FPNs issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycling on footway</td>
<td>1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cycle – contravening automatic traffic signals</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cycle – contravening constable on traffic duty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cycle – contravening constable or sign – royal park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cycle – contravening direction given by police constable/traffic survey</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cycle – contravening traffic signs</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cycle – contravening warden on traffic duty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cycle – failing to stop for a police constable</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cycle – lights not conforming or lit during hours of darkness</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cycle – riding where prohibited</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedal cycle – unauthorised passenger</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,376</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was an increase of over 35% in the number of FPNs issued for cycling related offences in 2005 compared with 2004. The most notable increases were for cycling on the footway (33%), contravening automatic traffic signals (42%), contravening traffic signals (45%) and lights not confirming or lit during hours of darkness (45%).
Westminster issued the highest number of FPNs in 2005 accounting for over 21% of the total FPNs issued for cycling related offences. Kensington and Chelsea issued just over 20% of the FPNs.

**Figure 16 Breakdown of FPNs by Local Authority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>FPNs Issued</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>21.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington and Chelsea</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>20.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>11.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Parks Constabulary</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Hamlets</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith and Fulham</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking and Dagenham</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haringey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bromley, Merton, Bexley, Harrow, Redbridge and Stepney issued less than five FPNs over the year.

**Road safety statistics**

The information below is taken from the London Road Safety Unit 12 Month Summary: January 2005 – December 2005, which was published in May 2006. It details the contributory factors and the nature of road traffic collisions resulting injury or fatality to pedal cyclists in Greater London during 2003 (the latest year for which finalised data is available).

**Summary of Pedal Cyclist Fatalities in 2003**

The most common conflict in fatal Pedal Cycling collisions (32%) involved the Pedal Cyclists and other vehicle travelling alongside each other. Overall there has been a 40% reduction in road casualties compared with 1994-1998 baseline. Cycling casualties in London have also fallen to their lowest levels with a total of 2895 for 2005.

Two worrying trends that confirm the need for more vigorous and coordinated activity to make cycling safer:

- Increase in killed and seriously injured from all time low in 2004
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Increase in percentage of all casualties
16% involved the Pedal Cyclists moving from the near side to the office across the path of the other vehicle. Two pedal cyclists (11%) were killed hitting or swerving to avoid a door being opened into their path.

In 42% of fatal collisions the pedal cyclist was in collision with a car and in 32% with heavy goods vehicle (over 7.5 Tonnes).

CCE continues to work on an ongoing campaign addressing the serious nature of HGV and cyclist collisions to raise awareness and improve safety with LRSU and freight organisations.

All casualties arising from collisions in which a pedal cyclist is injured

In 2003 there were 3,056 casualties arising from 3,039 collisions involving pedal cyclists. 97.7% of these casualties in these collisions were the cyclist, and less than 1% of any other road user in those collisions was injured.

There were a total of 5,969 vehicles involved in these 3,039 collisions. After pedal cycles, the most common vehicles involved were cars (2,214 or 37% of vehicles), then goods vehicles (300 or 5%).

Comparative casualty rates by vehicle mode of travel

Pedal cycles have the second highest casualty rate per 100 million vehicle kilometres (563.6 for all casualties, 81.1 for KSIs and 482.5 for slight) after powered-two wheelers (750.8, 133.7 and 617.1 respectively). Cycling represented 1.6% of estimated vehicle kilometres travelled and 10% of casualties. When compared with the rate for cars and taxis of 69.7 for all casualties, 6.6 for KSIs and 63.1 for slight, the vulnerability of these two-wheeled modes of travel becomes even more apparent. When vehicle occupancy is also taken into account, the relative risk to pedal cyclists compared with car occupants is even greater. Viewed as a casualty rate per 100 million person kilometres, the pedal cycle rate does not change, but the rate for car occupants falls to 46.5 for all severities, 4.4 for KSIs and 42.1 for slight injuries.

The table below is based on data collated from the Casualties in Greater London Quarterly Reports published between April 2003 – May 2006. The table shows the number of pedal cyclist casualties each year from 2002 to 2005. It also shows the total number and total percentages of casualties for all modes of transport between 2002 to 2005.

Figure 17 Pedal Cyclist (P/C) Casualties in Greater London between 2002 to 2005 – by Severity and Percentage Change from Previous Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Change Over Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>2,895</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>3,436</td>
<td>28,180</td>
<td>31,830</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Modes Total in '04</th>
<th>% of Total in '04 for All Modes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,953</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,386</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34,555</td>
<td>-10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P/C Casualties 2003</th>
<th>All Modes Total in '03</th>
<th>% of Total in '03 for All Modes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>3,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P/C Casualties 2002</th>
<th>All Modes Total in '02</th>
<th>% of Total in '02 for All Modes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>2,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>3,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Similar international campaigns

The concept of ‘Share the Road’ has also been implemented in other cities.

Contested Streets Provides New Route Adding to NYC’s Ambitious New Bike Plan
Contested Streets Provides New Route Adding to NYC’s Ambitious New Bike Plan - London, Copenhagen and Paris Provide the Model to Meet the Needs of NYC’s Commuters-

Related Website: www.transalt.org

The Full Story:

New York, NY (September 2006) – Striving to make it into the hands of a wider group of livable streets advocates and New York city officials, non-profit group Transportation Alternatives (T.A.) has taken their film Contested Streets to DVD, as well as to planned screenings worldwide. Co-producers Mark Gorton, successful entrepreneur, founder and director of the Lime Group and Paul Steely White, director of T.A., plan to use this film to gain awareness and impact city officials decisions regarding sharing the city’s streets among vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians – making the streets safer and easier to navigate.

Contested Streets: Breaking NYC Gridlock explores ways cities around the world are breaking free from the chokehold of traffic, enhancing quality of life and environmental sustainability and allowing room for their economies to grow and flourish. The unusual partnership between the two producers and their organizations has allowed for access to a diverse group of interviews that are collected in this film, which features some of our generation’s brightest minds from the business, transportation and urban planning arenas.

Luminaries and experts appearing on camera include: Kenneth T. Jackson, President, New York Historical Society, Encyclopaedia of New York author; Majora Carter; Executive Director, Sustainable South Bronx, recent recipient of MacArthur Genius Award; Bob Kiley; former CEO, the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority and recent Commissioner of Transport for London; Kathryn Wylde President and CEO, Partnership for New York City; and Fred Kent, President, Project for Public Spaces.

"Cities like London, Paris and Copenhagen are redesigning their streets to make cycling and walking more viable transportation options. They are adding capacity to their transportation systems while improving quality of life for all of their residents. New York City’s recent announcement shows that our leaders are taking notice of these successes," said T.A.’s White.

September has been a huge month for both cyclists and pedestrians in New York City. Mayor Bloomberg announced the city’s groundbreaking plan to add 200 miles of bike lanes over the
next three years to city streets, as well as signage to remind vehicles to share the road, and higher fines for drivers blocking the bicycle lanes. This change comes following a series of unfortunate bicycle related deaths this summer that drew a higher level of awareness from all New Yorkers. Since 1996, over 225 cyclists have been killed in New York City. Although these changes are nothing short of amazing, Transportation Alternatives will not rest until bicycling and walking in the city are truly safe, and convenient transportation for all New Yorkers is implemented.

In response to safety concerns on New York City streets and inspired by the changes that cities like London, Copenhagen and Paris have brought about on their streets, T.A. and the NYC Bike Coalition drafted the "Bike Safety Action Plan," a year-old precursor to the city’s new plan. The plan demands a number of changes, including a call for the City of New York to commit to a comprehensive study of all NYC bike fatalities since 1996 to be released in a City Hall event no later than September 30, 2006; develop and implement an aggressive, ongoing enforcement campaign to deter drivers from illegal behaviors that put cyclists in peril; commit to implementing the "Bike Master Plan" by 2010 with the goal of putting every New Yorker within a half mile of the bike network.

Contested Streets first premiered to an audience of city officials, business leaders, urban planners and environmentalists at the IFC Center on June 27th, 2006. T.A. will continue to screen the film to smaller audiences worldwide via grassroots living room screenings and larger showings at venues such as MAKOR in the Steinhardt Center of the 92nd Street Y.

About Transportation Alternatives:
Since its founding in 1973 during the explosion of environmental consciousness that also produced the Clean Air, Clean Water Act and the Environmental Protection Agency, Transportation Alternatives has helped win numerous improvements for cyclists and pedestrians and has been the leading voice for reducing car use in New York City. T.A.’s roots are in bicycling, but winning a cycling-friendly city means changing the overall transportation system. T.A. seeks to change the city’s transportation priorities to encourage and increase non-polluting, quiet, city-friendly travel and decrease—not ban—private car use. To achieve its goals, T.A. works in five areas: Bicycling, Walking and Traffic Calming, Car-Free Parks, Safe Streets and Sensible Transportation.

For more information regarding Contested Streets, review copies, or to speak with a T.A./Contested Streets representative, please contact Jill Meisner (jmeisner@pitchcontrolpr.com) or Sarah Cirkiel (scirkiel@pitchcontrolpr.com), Pitch Control Public Relations, 212.475.4919. The film trailer and complete list of the film stars and producers are available at transalt.org/campaigns/reclaiming/contestedstreets.

Paris also launched a similar campaign in the same week as the share the road campaign in London.
## Appendix 4 Stakeholders for Share the Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User groups</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>Simon Brammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist</td>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>Adam Coffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist</td>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>Gill Kerr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist</td>
<td>AA- Motoring Trust</td>
<td>Andrew Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist</td>
<td>Institute of Advanced Motoring</td>
<td>David Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist</td>
<td>Freight Transport Association</td>
<td>Gordon Telling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist</td>
<td>Road Haulage Association</td>
<td>Chrys Rampley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist</td>
<td>British School of Motoring</td>
<td>Andy Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorist</td>
<td>Motorcycle Industry Association</td>
<td>Barbara Alam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>Living Streets</td>
<td>Simon Barnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Road Peace</td>
<td>Cynthia Barlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Transport 2000</td>
<td>Norman Beddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Sustrans</td>
<td>Carl Pittam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TfL/MPS/GLA</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police</td>
<td>Ian Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Police</td>
<td>Titus Halliwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TfL - Walking &amp; Cycling</td>
<td>N. Veena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TfL - Walking &amp; Cycling</td>
<td>Adrian Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TfL - Walking &amp; Cycling</td>
<td>Rose Ades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TfL - Walking &amp; Cycling</td>
<td>Jen Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TfL Marketing</td>
<td>Nigel Marson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TfL Marketing</td>
<td>Paul Amlani-Hatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TfL Marketing</td>
<td>Alix Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TfL Press Office</td>
<td>Stephen Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Buses</td>
<td>Simon Wallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Carriage Office</td>
<td>Luke Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Carriage Office pedicabs</td>
<td>Richard Hodges &amp; Luke Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport Policing &amp; Enforcement</td>
<td>Angela Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport Policing &amp; Enforcement</td>
<td>Anji Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Party</td>
<td>Ian Wingrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Party</td>
<td>David Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLA - Transport Team</td>
<td>Becky Upfold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLA - Press Office</td>
<td>Hilary Merrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLA - Marketing</td>
<td>Harry Barlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Borough</td>
<td>Chris Bainbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>