

# Stop killing cyclists!

## Action Plan

### Outline for Highways Agency

Peter Fox  
July 2003

As the Highways Agency management refuses to get to grips with its serious safety problems affecting cyclists and apparently caused by general ignorance and unwillingness to adapt designs for cyclists here is a simple requirement for an Action plan to address these matters.

#### **1 The purpose of this action plan is to**

##### **1.a Address the following problems**

- 1 Engineers are ignorant about practical cycling
- 2 There appears to be no qualified checking of consultant's designs
- 3 Safety assessments are badly designed or incompetently carried out
- 4 Senior management has no interest in addressing these matters

##### **1.b Provide a framework for remedial management action**

#### **2 In order to discover the root causes, these questions need answers:**

##### **2.a How can these things happen?**

- 1 How can an obviously dangerous junction scheme be passed as safe? i.e. Lynfields Roundabout proposals
- 2 Why was the HA unable to recognise the general danger of roundabouts to cyclists. i.e. Witham Cycle Campaign pointed this out but were ignored.
- 3 How is it possible for a highway engineer to propose a cycle track half a metre from a dual carriageway? i.e. Mr Davenport from Bullens.
- 4 Why were the HA so adamant about the appropriateness of item 3, only accepting the *possibility* of a barrier under pressure at the public enquiry and then not acceding to the demand for proper separation.

##### **2.b What is the reason for lack of cycling knowledge?**

- 1 It is apparent that the HA's engineers and consultants are ignorant about very basic cycling matters. e.g. Designing a completely unnecessary cycle facility on a road that was to become a very quiet lane at Wellington bridge, Hatfield Peverel.
- 2 It is apparent that the HA's engineers and consultants have no practical experience of cycling. e.g items 1-3 in 2.a.
- 3 It is apparent that the HA's engineers and consultants have no technical knowledge of cycling. e.g item 1 in 2.a.

2.c **Where is the checking and quality assurance?**

- 1 That items 1-3 in 2.b are allowed to get into public plans indicates a multi-level lack of cycling awareness.
- 2 See item 2 of 2.a

**3 Management will need a plan to deal with the following issues**

3.a **Using cycling knowledge**

- 1 Identify what sorts of cycling knowledge are required
- 2 How to bring in cycling knowledge to early-stage designs
- 3 How to bring in cycling knowledge to detailed design stages
- 4 How to either/or/both
  - Change the safety of junction assessment procedure
  - Ensure it is carried out with proper regard for cyclists
- 5 How to improve the general level of cycling awareness amongst HA staff
- 6 How to provide access to experts as required

3.b **Appropriate use of cycling knowledge within the design process**

- 1 Where in the design process are inputs of cycling knowledge most likely to be valuable?
- 2 What is likely to be the sources for these inputs?
- 3 How are clashes between cycling and other requirements to be resolved?

3.c **Public confidence**

- 1 How will the public have confidence in a process which is so discredited?
- 2 How will the HA review existing facilities?
- 3 How will the HA address problematic design issues? e.g. Being blinded by headlights when using a 'right-hand' track.

**4 Management responsibility**

4.a The action plan is safety-critical so needs to be controlled at a high-level of responsibility.

4.b The matters covered in the Action plan affect all roads design and maintenance so needs to be conducted at a sufficiently high level to cover all road matters.

4.c There will inevitably be the need for cultural changes so a champion for change will need to be identified.