Borough comments from teams

Bus stop bypass review

Is there a separate review into bus boarders?

did/could the research also include any interviews/research with cyclists themselves about their perspectives and if these arrangements made cyclists feel safer going behind bus stops than mixing with traffic....?

:

Have you talked with Transport for Greater Manchester who have been running a similar study?

Re the TfG M work, contact Tom Bailey @Streets_Systems

I understood an announcement was imminent from TfL about improvements to on bus announcements across London. Is that coming soon?

:

Are the differences in one way and two way cycle tracks?

:

On non-infra measures, have mini-zebras been incorporated in to the National Standard for Cycle Training?

Perhaps engagement with food delivery companies/riders (among other issues) who are under a particular time/cost pressure.

Perhaps using the vertical deflection earlier to reduce speed more in advance of the crossing point (to reduce both subjective and actual risk), as I think the hump is just at the actual crossing point in the currents standard.

:

If the main issue raised by older/disabled people is being given a 'fright', did the research include locational interviews with users? In other words, to judge the level of near misses.

I think signage could help, but needs to be consistent across boroughs and TLRN, and built into the design guidance e.g. signs saying "pedestrian priority"

jeffersons comment - boorughs can emphasise this through STARS and cycle training work with children and adults taking up training.

Posters on the rear of buses can be effective for road user eductaion? Similar to changes in priorities for buses pulling out from bus stops.

Paint strips to create a subtle texture change on approach to the BSB horizontal deflections could be an option to slow Cycles, but could have an impact on accessibility

:

If the cycle path looks more like carriageway than footway, then that would lead to cyclists assuming priority. Perhaps a design where the bypass route uses material more like footway format and raised more to footway level. Any comparison possible between these formats across installed sites.

:

Of course, cyclists yielding to pedestrians at a point where drivers don't have to yield (because passing stopped buses on the offside) reduces cyclist level of service. Where cyclists are on-carriageway, passing stopped buses on offside (ideally without having to negotiate space with other drivers) should be the norm

Borough Bus Briefing - meeting note

12 October

3. Bus stop bypass review – Stephanie Pathak, Strategy and Planning Manager and Lucy Marstrand-Taussig, Principal Technical Specialist

Q&As

Scope of the review

- Borough colleagues asked if bus borders were being included in the review
- TfL confirmed that the focus of the review was on bus stop bypasses exclusively
- Borough colleagues asked if TfL had spoken with Transport for Greater Manchester, which was doing a similar review
- TfL said it would follow-up with the transport authority and would be interested in the findings

Signage, publicity, and communications around bus stop bypasses

- Borough colleagues advised that the DfT had previously said no to signs being introduced at bus stop bypasses to ask cyclists to yield to pedestrians
- TfL said it would follow-up with the DfT and take this into account as part of the review
- Borough officers asked if TfL would consider leading a London-wide publicity campaign reminding cyclists to yield to pedestrians at crossings
- TfL advised that an education campaign would be considered as part the outcome of the review. TfL advised that work was ongoing with food delivery services, such as Deliveroo, on signing up to a road safety charter. TfL advised that the London Cycling Campaign was being included in the review

Casualty analysis

- Borough colleagues asked if the review/ data considered the design of the infrastructure i.e., ramps and gradients on the approach to zebra crossings
- TfL said this would be considered as part of the review
- Borough colleagues asked if on board messaging advising passengers that they were alighting in a bus stop bypass would skew the data
- Borough officers asked if the approach speeds of cyclists were considered in the video monitoring
- TfL advised that this could be reviewed.

Bus stop bypass design and future requirements

- Borough colleagues shared feedback from accessibility groups, specifically blind and partially sighted stakeholders, about the need for additional design to assist with getting to the zebra/ pedestrian crossing points once alighting from buses
- TfL said this would be investigated
- Borough officers asked if there would be a requirement to retrofit existing bus stop bypasses
- TfL advised that this could be a possible long-term outcome and any outcome would apply to TfL-managed roads

Next steps

• TfL has held a workshop with stakeholders and is hoping to publish the report in December. Boroughs can contact (atfl.gov.uk to arrange follow-up discussions

IDAG Feedback Personal statement

I am pedestrian I have never been involved in an accident with a motor vehicle, but I have had 4 collisions with bicycles. The first was when I was age 7. The other three all took place in London, all on zebra or pelican crossings. All involved the cyclist going too fast through stationery traffic at the crossing that I had right of way over (the cyclists went through red lights or could clearly see that vehicles had stopped for me and others to cross the zebra.)

On all occasions I was injured. I attempted to report the last incident in 2014 to the council, TfL, and police but no one would take my report because it involved a cyclist and pedestrian.

It is the psychological effect that has had the greatest impact on my life. From the age of 7 I suffered from extreme anxiety when crossing roads. I would feel sick every time I had to cross a road no matter how small the road. A mobility officer helped me gain my confidence, but the anxiety never left me. I recently had EMDR trauma therapy and the first aspect of trauma I focussed on was my fear of crossing roads. As a result of this expensive and difficult therapy my confidence at crossing roads has increased and I now ride a mountain bike (always off road.) Something which seemed impossible just a few years ago. I tell you this to demonstrate the psychological impact these collisions have on people's lives. It affected me daily and still often does.

But even after all that therapy and years of just sucking up my fear I am still terrified at crossing certain roads and using bus stop bypasses in London on certain days. It means that I visit London less often than I

used to. I change the routes I take to avoid having to use bus stop bypasses or to cross cycle lanes in general. Not every day is a good day.

I am conscious that this may seem like an over reaction to what must seem like something trivial to someone with average vision. In the past I would never have shared something as personal as this with anyone in a professional setting. I would be too self-conscious and fear that you wouldn't take my evidence as credible or worth listening to because it's personal. Because it's about the psychological effect of a piece of road infrastructure.

But I've spent the last 25 years trying to improve the accessibility and inclusion of our built environment and public transport, sharing all the research I did for the R NIB and Disability Rights Commission with decision makers. I've drafted examples used in the codes of practice for the DDA and Equality Act. And it's made a difference some things have improved. But BSB's are an example of a design feature which is supposed to benefit one group, cyclists but has had a huge psychological impact on another group, visually impaired, disabled and older people.

And I am yet to see categorical evidence that BSB reduce accidents for cyclists? It does seem logical that they should but is there evidence to show this? There should also be an acknowledgement of the distress that this new infrastructure causes many disabled and older people. I'm a cyclist and a person with a visual impairment. I see both sides of this argument. I wish the roads were safe for me to cycle on. I adapt the way I get around every day because the world around me is not accessible. I must do this, or I'd never leave the house. It is always the disabled people who must adapt. We always must take the longer, more difficult, or dangerous route. We change our behaviour to fit in with an inaccessible world or people who don't understand or want us there. We daily take risks that others wouldn't dream of, to be as independent as possible. Sometimes it makes me very weary that other groups of people in society will not adapt or change their behaviour to accommodate others.

Feedback on the presentation

I'm providing this feedback in case you're recycling this or part of this presentation for your stakeholder events.

Although context and background are important to this project. The fact that the first 9 slides are just about that context and background is slightly frustrating and feels like you're being defensive. Or that you are shaming those with concerns about bypass bus stops. No one would disagree with your aims to reduce all casualties on the roads whether it's

cyclists, horse riders or pedestrians. But it comes across as if you feel that those with concerns about bus stop bypasses aren't aware of the need for safety for everyone.

S lide 11 I'm afraid is just insulting.

"They are designed to reduce road danger to people cycling without compromising the needs of people walking or travelling by bus, regardless of ability."

They don't do this. They do compromise the needs of disabled and older people. This might have been the intention, but it isn't the experience for many disabled people. If you're using this language whilst meeting with stakeholders, I'm afraid many will be rightly upset.

Questions and observations

Slide 12 Over 160 BSBs exist across London, why are there only between 40 – 50 with zebra crossings? That's less than a third? You also say that just over a third aren't best practice but if zebras are best practice, then surely its over two thirds not meeting best practice. Slide 13 Do you know the proportion of cyclists who have done the TfL training? I've done the online training and it's very good, but I am doubtful as to how many people actually know about it or have taken part.

I'd have liked to have seen more stats around the percentage of cyclists not slowing down or yielding. Every time that happened that's another knock to someone's confidence.

Improved safety features and behaviour change

Add physical features to BSBs that make cyclists slow down, narrowing of lane at zebra possibly? Better signage about the need to slow down. Warning lights or signals encouraging cyclists to slow down.

Make the space available on the island at the bus stop wider, many are very narrow and crowded when buses are busy. Many people are forced into the cycle lane.

Many pedestrians don't use the zebras they just wander across anywhere and this frustrates the cyclists understandably. Better design to make it less inviting for pedestrians to just walk out away from the zebra.

IDAG feedback:

- Encourage some understanding of how their presentation comes across, especially if they're planning to use it or part of it with stakeholders.
- Encourage some understanding of the impact this type of infrastructure has on VIPs in particular but others as well. We might not be getting run over but the psychological effect of being put into what feels like a hostile environment is quite profound.
- I'd like to see more detailed info about their research answering the following questions:
 - o Is there any direct evidence that BSBs save lives?
 - o Do BSBs drive modal shift?
 - o How many cyclists didn't yield to pedestrians?
 - o Are some sites more complex than others as far as interactions go?
- I was involved with some of the work Living S treets have been doing on this. They are yet to report their findings so I can't share much but I'd hoped that TfL's research would have been similar in scope and depth but what's shared here was really disappointing as far as findings are concerned.
- And obviously share ideas for how to change behaviours. That bit is really hard though

IDAG meeting notes

The meeting with IDAG was helpful for flagging areas where the framing will be important and elements that they are likely to be upset about – both in the presentation and from the pre-reading pack we sent out.

Key points:

- Oystercard data may show no statistically significant drop in freedom pass users but it doesn't capture those that are still using the stops because they have to but are now experiencing a great deal of fear and anxiety doing so
- Collision data doesn't include those not reported I acknowledged this in my voice over and that was welcomed
- We mention the changes to cycle training and the cycle safeway videos in the slides (and in the pre-reading material we've sent to stakeholders) this created a feeling of anger / felt offensive as it is obviously not enough and doesn't reach all cyclists (stats on how many trained and how many have watched the videos are attached in case needed).
- We have the quote in our pre-reading pack "They are designed to reduce road danger to people cycling without compromising the needs of people walking or travelling by bus, regardless of ability." This was felt to be insulting and upsetting as the experience is that they compromise the needs of disabled and older people.
- They mentioned bus stop boarders and the tremendous fear from using these, at some points some of the comments were around this infrastructure and the issues with it
- They felt that having so many context slides about Vision Zero and why cycle safety was important was frustrating and felt defensive. Or that we were shaming those with concerns about bypasses they understand that and the need for cycle safety but it doesn't acknowledge the fear they are experiencing

• The review doesn't attempt to capture people's feelings, opinions etc. – there's nothing wrong with the data collected but it misses the impact on people and it's disappointing that this qualitative data hasn't been included at all

In terms of suggestions going forward they were mainly around design and included:

- Wider bus stop areas so there's no risk of going into the cycle track
- Encouraging slowing down cyclists using physical design
- Signage, warning lights or signals encouraging cyclists to slow down
- Better design to make it less inviting for pedestrians to just walk out away from the zebra