

Item 5 – Experimental Use of Bus Lanes by Motorcycles

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): We move to agenda item five: motorcycles in bus lanes. This is one that came across our paths because we noticed that there was not absolute accord between these two bodies on the subject, and we thought it would be very important and interesting for us to get the views in, both from Transport for London, who are running the experiment, and from both motorcycle and cycle groups.

I have apologies from Oliver Hatch, from the Cyclists' Public Affairs Group, who was unable to come at the last minute.

David Rowe, Transport for London: Morning, my name is David Rowe and I am Head of Project Development at TfL surface transport. I am just going to give you a little bit of background into the pilots that we have been undertaking. The Mayor's transport strategy requires TfL, through the London Motor Cycle Working Group, to consider experiments to allow powered two-wheelers to share bus lanes.

The arguments for doing so are: motorcyclists make up something like 2-3% of traffic on our roads but are involved in 20% of killed and serious injuries; also, potentially allowing motorcyclists to share bus lanes reduces their exposure to general traffic and increases their conspicuousness. The situation we face in London is something half of killed and serious injuries on motor cycles are because drivers do not see the motorcyclist, so we have to look at where there are opportunities to increase the visibility.

The arguments against are: firstly, the principle of allowing private motorised vehicles into bus lanes; the potential impact on other vehicles already using those bus lanes in terms of congestion, i.e. what they do to buses; and potential conflicts, notably with cyclists and pedestrians. Before considering pilots in London, we examined schemes where they had already introduced their motor cycles into bus lanes, principally Bristol, Bath, Birmingham, Colchester, Hull and Reading. But the monitoring, we felt, was limited, in that the monitoring had largely focussed on before and after casualties, and did not look at things like journey times, speeds and levels of usage, i.e. did it actually discourage cyclists from using these routes?

We therefore had discussions with the Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) and with the Department of Transport, who were also very keen to get a much clearer picture on what the impact would be, to help inform the national debate on this issue.

The pilots within London were chosen on the criteria of sites on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), locations where there are reasonably high levels of powered two-wheeler usage, there were standard with-flow bus lanes, and there was a mix of different frontages and different types of locations, so there were business premises, there were residential premises, there were shopping premises. We had a good cross-section of the different types of bus lanes that exist in London.

Three sites were chosen: the A13 in east London; the A23 in south London; and the A41 in north London, and I have some plans that are helpful in showing the locations of those. The pilots began in September and October 2002. Monitoring was agreed with the

Department of Transport, and essentially what we are looking at are before and after surveys of casualties, usage and users, speeds, bus journey times, and cyclists' attitudes.

One of the factors that we have recognised when we have been looking at the monitoring output so far is that we needed to better isolate some of the external factors that have played a part in what has happened on these corridors. I am thinking of things like Congestion Charging, because we have seen reductions in the overall levels of traffic and some slight increases in journey speeds for all vehicles. That is something to bear in mind when we go through the results we have had so far. Would it be helpful if I just outlined the key findings we have had so far?

Overall, injury accidents on the corridors where the trial sites are have fallen by 4.1%. Accidents involving powered two-wheelers have fallen by 8%, but that compares with a London-wide situation of a 12% fall. There have been large variations between the different trial sites. On the A13 accidents are significantly down, especially for powered two-wheelers. On the A23, there is a slight reduction overall, and for powered two-wheelers; and on the A41 powered two-wheelers have fallen below the London-wide average, but overall the number of accidents along that corridor for all users is about the same. I think what I would try and draw your attention to here is that 11 months' worth of casualty data, which is what we have so far, is insufficient to allow us to draw any conclusions about the safety benefits or disbenefits.

With regard to usage on the corridors, we used traffic cameras that we have positioned along each of the locations to record classified counts. Permitted vehicles in bus lanes were up 9%, which is consistent with increasing levels of bus frequency and increasing numbers of taxis coming into the centre. But also cyclists' levels of activity were up 22% on these corridors. Powered two-wheelers in the bus lanes were up 17%, and all other vehicles in the bus lanes were up 10%, which is potentially an issue for TfL. Obviously what we would not want to see is a situation where allowing powered two-wheelers into bus lanes led to other road users thinking it was okay for those to also use bus lanes, so cars also encroaching.

Overall along the corridors powered two-wheeler usage is down 8%, which is an interesting fact to note, and all other vehicles not in bus lanes are down 5%. As I say, that may well be due to external factors, such as Congestion Charging, because the corridors that we are looking at are quite important radial routes into central London.

Regarding speeds and bus journey times, we did short snapshots of speeds with people in my team going out with speed guns. The before data for powered two-wheeler speeds, I think it is fair to say is unrepresentative, because the way that powered two-wheelers were using the bus lanes beforehand was that they were nipping into the bus lanes where there was a queue to get round the queue quickly and then come out of the bus lanes again quickly before they were caught by the cameras or by the cameras on the buses. So they were doing so at reasonably high speeds. The after survey speeds for motorcyclists are lower in the bus lanes, but that is because they can now use those facilities legally, so you would expect them to travel at a more reasonable speed.

Overall speeds for all road users on those corridors increased by 1-2 mph. I think that is probably related to the fact that we have had a 5% reduction in the overall levels of traffic on those corridors. The reduction in speed on the A13, except for buses... bus speeds are up on the A13 and the A23, but unchanged on the A41, and bus journey time has increased by about 7%, so it does not seem to be affecting bus reliability.

We did before and after attitudinal surveys with cyclists, and this is something that was requested when we met with cycle groups before we introduced the pilots. We asked cyclists three main questions. The first one was about their experience of collisions with other vehicles in bus lanes, or near misses. The second was concerning the main problems they face, and the third one was what they would like to see to improve their use of those bus lanes. In terms of near misses - motorbikes, before the introduction of the pilots 2% of cyclists claim to have had a near miss, and that rose to 6% after. There were no actual collisions recorded. That needs to be compared with other concerns that cyclists had, such as near misses with cars, which were in the region of 28% beforehand and rose to 38% after.

Of the main problems faced by cyclists beforehand, the motorcycle was raised by 2% of respondents, and then raised by 6% after. Of the potential improvements suggested by cyclists, only 3% of cyclists suggested no motor cycles in bus lanes could improve their situation, before and the same 3%, again after. So quite low numbers on all of those in relation to motor cycles.

In summary, we think it is too early to draw any conclusions and we are particularly keen that we get sufficient casualty data to ensure we have a robust before and after analysis of what the impacts have been.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): Thank you very much, David.

Val Shawcross (AM): Can I just ask a couple of factual questions? Did you have any figures for changes in accidents to cyclists during this period? Can you just tell me what they were, again?

David Rowe, TfL: The changes in casualties to cyclists were that there was an increase from 35 for the 11-month period before the trial to 41 in the 11-month period after. But the number of casualties actually in the bus lanes on those corridors was two before and one after for cyclists. So, again, I would urge health warnings in relation to that, given that we have only got 11 months' worth of data.

Val Shawcross (AM): Was it actual numbers, not percentages? You said 2% of traffic is motor bike traffic in London. What percentage is cycling traffic?

David Rowe, TfL: It is about 2.5% and motor cycles are actually about 2.5% as well.

Val Shawcross (AM): About equal numbers of those?

David Rowe, TfL: Yes.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): I will just ask one other simple question, which is: when you are looking at accident levels with powered two-wheelers, do you distinguish between the different powers of the vehicles and do you distinguish between accidents caused where speed is an issue and ones where there might be some other cause?

David Rowe, TfL: We do have that data. Basically, motorcyclists are recorded in three groups: a moped, which is under 50cc; under 125cc; and anything above that. That is the way they categorise the different groupings. Then there are causal factors, which are

recorded by the police at the time of the casualty, in terms of if they felt there was a speed problem, if the road surface was wet, if it was dark – those types of details.

We need to drill more into that to help us understand what the causal factors are behind the casualties that have occurred, and I must admit that that is something that we are still working on and we have not completed yet.

Val Shawcross (AM): Is there a differential across the different powers of motorbike for accident rates?

David Rowe, TfL: The reason that it is partly recorded like that, because under 125cc you would expect to see more learner drivers and under 50cc, you would expect to see more younger drivers, of the 16 to 17-year-old age group as well. So there are quite different characteristics. It tends to be people on the bigger bikes that are more experienced riders.

Val Shawcross (AM): Is there a different weighting of accidents for the different weights or powers of bikes?

David Rowe, TfL: I would need to come back to you on that.

Val Shawcross (AM): Do people on the 50cc bikes have the same accident rates as the people on the big powerful burn up the road jobs?

David Rowe, TfL: At a London-wide level, it does not suggest that there is an increasing problem with smaller bikes. We did some work for TfL, because we were particularly interested in whether learner motorcyclists in London had particular problems. The analysis of the casualty data did not suggest that the smaller bikes were where the particular problems were; it tended to be a fairly even spread.

Val Shawcross (AM): An even spread? Thank you.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): Presumably the age of the driver is material as well. We could get a bit too detailed on this, but anecdotally young people wrap themselves around trees and as you get older you tend not to do it so often. Presumably, that is measured in some way.

David Rowe, TfL: Yes, the type of bike and the age of the person who is involved.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): I guess where we might be heading, even before we have heard any of the other witnesses, is a more detailed understanding of the different types of circumstances and drivers of vehicles and their relationship to this project.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): May I ask if questionnaires to cyclists were handed out at differing points along all of the experimental routes?

David Rowe, TfL: The cyclists attitudinal surveys were only done on the A23. We chose the A23 of the three corridors because that is where the highest level of cycling activity was and we wanted a fairly good representative sample. They were handed out in the hours of operation in the bus lane. Beforehand I think it was something like 250 we handed out, and we got 128 back. After it was about 300 we handed out, and we got 90 back. So those are the sorts of numbers of cyclists.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): Was it at differing points on that route?

David Rowe, TfL: No, on one location along that corridor – at the mid point of the corridor.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): When you made the decision to extend the period in which you are going to be doing the experiment, was there a survey again then? Or was that the one you were talking about getting 90 back from?

David Rowe, TfL: The 90 back was basically 12 months' after the introduction of the trial, so we had 12 months' worth of data. We will be undertaking another cyclists' attitudinal survey closer to when we have sufficient accident data, probably about 18 months, to see whether cyclists' views have changed at all in relation to the use of the bus lanes.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): Before the experiment was actually introduced, was any evidence about potential disbenefits to cyclists and other road users considered when you decided how to do this?

David Rowe, TfL: The reason we went down the route of undertaking pilots was because of concern about the potential impacts on cyclists. As I say, when we looked at other cities that are introducing the schemes, they did not seem to have sufficient information on cyclists' attitude and particularly whether cyclists' levels of use of those corridors was affected. Just because casualty rates did not go up, it might have been because cyclists were frightened off using these corridors because of the motorcycling, which is why we felt it was important to do the attitudinal surveys and the actual counts of cycling. The output that we have suggests that cyclists are not reducing their use of these corridors – if anything it is going up.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): From the evidence: 'Camden noted with concern' that the experiment 'was mounted without sufficient consultation with the borough'. What consultation was undertaken with the boroughs?

David Rowe, TfL: The method of determining the three corridors was, first, we had a long list of sites that we took to the London Motor Cycle Working Group, which includes borough representative and the Association of London Government (ALG). We then produced a shortlist. There was then the statutory consultation in relation to the changes to the traffic management orders associated with the bus lanes. We also wrote to the boroughs affected beforehand, advising them of the intention to run these trials, and outlining the monitoring requirement and regime that we would be undertaking to help us determine the impacts of the schemes.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): I thought I detected some disagreement in the room. Were you wishing to comment on that, if you have an alternative view?

Charlie Lloyd, London Cycling Campaign: No, just to say that we were not consulted as an organisation before this trial.

Roger Evans (AM): Yes, thank you Chair. When are you going to make a decision on whether this is going to be a permanent scheme that is going to apply throughout the rest of London? How are you going to make that decision?

David Rowe, TfL: I think the first stage is for us to have sufficient information to detail the benefits and disbenefits, and when we do have that information then it will be appropriate

to weigh up whether these schemes should be continued, or whether they should be extended. Ultimately we do not have that sufficient information yet, so I am not in a position to determine how...

Roger Evans (AM): How long is that going to take? Your statisticians, presumably, can tell you how many years' worth of data...

David Rowe, TfL: We certainly feel we need at least 18 months' worth of casualty data to provide any robust statistical analysis.

Roger Evans (AM): So, that is another six months on top of what you have got?

David Rowe, TfL: Yes, another seven months' worth. On casualty data there is a bit of a lag between us getting the data in because the police record it.

Roger Evans (AM): What sort of consultation are you going to be doing before you reach that point?

David Rowe, TfL: In terms of determining whether the trial is extended?

Roger Evans (AM): Obviously a pilot is one thing, but a wider scheme for the whole of London is going to affect a lot more people. What would be your consultation approach? Should you be thinking about that now or waiting until you have got the statistics and you are deciding where to go?

David Rowe, TfL: Bus lanes are not solely within the auspices of TfL, insofar as the majority of bus lanes in London are in the control of the London boroughs. Now clearly we would be very happy to share the information that we have from the outputs of the pilots, but we will not be in a position to, and we would not want to dictate to the boroughs, that this is something that they should do or not do. It is purely a case of sharing the information from the pilot so they can understand what the impacts have been.

As I said, the reason that we chose pilots that had a fairly diverse make-up of different frontages associated with them was that they did represent a good cross-section of the different types of bus lane situations we face in London.

Roger Evans (AM): Indeed, so does the ALG have a role here?

David Rowe, TfL: The ALG is a member of the London Motor Cycle Working Group, and was involved in the identification of the corridors. As I say, we also wrote to the ALG when we wrote to the boroughs, outlining the monitoring regime we were undertaking.

Roger Evans (AM): Are you going to be looking at doing further trials with other sites?

David Rowe, TfL: Not at the moment. One thing we are looking to do... I mentioned that there is background activity which has had an impact on the trials – things like the introduction of Congestion Charging. What we want to do is identify what we are going to call 'control corridors', and the two that we are planning to use are the A5 Edgware Road and the A10 Kingsland Road, which have some similar levels of bus priority along them and similar characteristics. Using similar monitoring on those corridors will help us to isolate some of the background effects that are going on, like what has happened because of Congestion Charging, what has happened because of increasing our frequency of

buses on those corridors and some of the other externalities, which would be helpful to separate out.

Roger Evans (AM): You are monitoring those without bringing in any changes, so you can see what happens without them?

David Rowe, TfL: Yes, that is correct.

Roger Evans (AM): I would have thought you would be doing that already.

David Rowe, TfL: Well, we are doing it against London-wide background data, but we thought it would be useful to particularly focus our attentions around corridors that had very similar characteristics to the three trial corridors that we had.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): These are corridors; they are basically fairly high-density commuter routes into central London. If there was blanket permission for motor cycles to use bus lanes, that would include streets like Kensington High Street, if they have not taken all the bus lanes out of course, Oxford Street and other streets which have got a very busy pedestrian environment as well.

Speaking as a pedestrian from time to time, I would be rather alarmed that those sorts of streets, major shopping centres, should not be treated in the same way, on the same sort of survey data as these fairly pedestrian-unfriendly routes, where people tend to keep out of the street.

David Rowe, TfL: That is accepted, although I would highlight that some of these corridors do go through fairly dense shopping centres, such as Streatham, Brixton and places like that. There are high levels of pedestrian activity and interaction between different types of road users.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): I understand that Westminster are concerned that the trial locations are not typical and that might be one obvious reason why they would be concerned, because in Westminster it is a fairly dense environment with a lot of pedestrians, whether they are office workers or shoppers, who tend to stray in and out of the roads and the way in which bus lanes are treated might have a rather different impact on them than it would on a commuter route.

David Rowe, TfL: Absolutely.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): So you accept that?

David Rowe, TfL: We are not looking to be prescriptive; we are looking to share the information that we will get from these trials, not just in terms of London but also, as I said, in a national context, because the Department of Transport are very interested in helping them to determine whether this is something that is appropriate for other cities.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): If I could clarify one tiny housekeeping question, then. A bus lane on the Transport for London Road Network is, if you like, the property of Transport for London, and you can adjust the order for that. If it is a bus lane on a road controlled by a borough, it will up to that borough to amend the order to allow motor cycles on it. Is that right?

David Rowe, TfL: They are the responsible traffic and highways authority, yes.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): So we could be in a position where, if a local authority in London disagreed with the TfL policy, you might find some routes, if you like, where the Red Routes might have blanket permission for motor cycles and some of the boroughs which did not agree with the policy might restrict motor cycles, whereas others, who agreed with the policy would not, and it would become rather chaotic perhaps.

David Rowe, TfL: An important factor to recognise is that to progress these pilots we had to get permission from the Department of Transport, because ultimately the signing that we have used for the motorcycles on the bus lanes is experimental. It is not standard signing; it is not standard procedure to allow motorcycles into bus lanes. So if it was to become mainstream, it would need to be a recommendation from the Department of Transport rather than from TfL or any one of the London boroughs.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): But there is a risk then, because the order-making authorities, in fact there are 34 or 35 of them in London, and you could end up with a mishmash of policies if this is not managed thoughtfully.

David Rowe, TfL: But we do have a situation at the moment where some bus lanes allow taxis, some bus lanes do not, depending on the levels of activity. So it is not as though there is one standard for bus lanes at present.

Val Shawcross (AM): But is it not TfL's policy to try and create as standard an expectation amongst drivers about bus lanes as possible, in terms of things like operation of hours and trying to go for that universality?

David Rowe, TfL: We want to minimise the confusion to road users by having different types of signs, and that is something we were conscious of when we did these pilots, which is why we put up these signs.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): At this point I would like to introduce yourselves?

Gerard Livett, Greater London Motorcycle Action Group: My name is Gerard Livett; I am acting regional representative of the Greater London Motorcycle Action Group.

Cathy Phillpotts, British Motorcyclists' Federation: My name is Cathy Phillpotts; I am the political officer of the British Motorcyclists' Federation in London.

Craig Carey-Clinch, Director of Public Affairs, Motor Cycle Industry Association: I am Craig Carey-Clinch, from the Motor Cycle Industry Association. Thank you for letting us speak today.

It is really to support Transport for London's approach to this whole issue. But I fear that we have entered into rather vexed territory, with varying policies and opinions from different sides. I feel that today I would like to firstly concentrate on the basic questions that we were asked as part of the preparation for the scrutiny panel, and I will conclude with some more general comments.

I noticed that the presumption across this issue on a number of different forums is of the disbenefits to cyclists and other road users, as opposed to what could be done to help reduce casualty rates for motorcyclists and also to facilitate use of a mode of transport

which is increasingly being seen as an alternative to the car, which avoids congestion and, as new research based on more accurate test cycles is showing, that are actually polluting a lot less than people were given to believe before.

Use of bus lanes is consistent with creating this less vulnerable environment, and evidence outside of London from the schemes so far shows that this can be achieved without creating risk for other road users; it has been running in Bristol for 10 years, and has been permanent for quite a number of years there. Bristol in fact has recently extended the accessibility of bus lanes to motorcyclists to all the lanes in the area.

Accident data does not appear to show greater risks than those which already existed on the roads where the scheme is being trailed. This shows that the experiment should run for a full study period. The data presented today by TfL certainly shows some positive results, but I am in agreement with TfL on the point that we should draw too much at this stage; we do need a full data set.

With regard to London, TRL's data, contrary to what is suggested by other papers that have been submitted, do show a reduction in casualties amongst powered two-wheeler riders in 2003. Cycling and pedestrian casualties did rise in certain areas. If this was consistent with casualties with motorcyclists we would expect to see a rise across motor cycle users as well. The Motor Cycle Industry Association (MCI) has actually done a paper on this, which was submitted; it is a new observational study which we have done into bus lane use by cycles and motorcycles and other road users as well.

It shows that around 40% of motorcyclists use the lanes which are open and available. Other users did not seem to be affected; pavement use by cyclists is low, and users appear to share the bus lanes without any additional risk or conflict. However, we have noted serious issues regarding the interaction of bicycles with buses, which is maybe down to bus driver behaviour, which we noted in our research, and I do feel that deserves some urgent attention and would make life easier for cyclists.

Powered two-wheelers using bus lanes tend to be slower than some of their counterparts which do not. We have found little evidence that powered two-wheelers use the clear space to greatly exceed the speed limit. There are other road users to consider, such as cyclists and buses. There is a rather negative assumption of speeding motorcyclists in bus lanes, which has not been borne out really in any research that I have seen.

You tend to find that the irresponsible few, of which all road users have a certain amount, tend to stay outside of the bus lane, because clearly the bus lane does not provide the sort of rapid ahead movement, which one would expect if you were indulging in risky riding behaviour. I think bus lanes actually help to moderate the speed of motorcyclists and certainly what David (Rowe) has just said tends to bear that out.

User perceptions, as presented by the cycle lobby, are actually at wide variance by those determined by other studies: our own, Transport for London, who have said a few words, the Transport Research Laboratory also conducted user surveys into experimental use of advanced stop lines, for example, and they showed that acceptability increased after motor cycles were allowed in.

With regard to other cycle facilities, yes, I think it is fair to say that the large and widespread use of other cycle facilities by powered two-wheelers has been observed. In the case of the advanced stop lines this is because this helps to reduce powered two-

wheeler vulnerability and adds to accessibility, and studies so far do not indicate increased risk to cyclists. Regarding motorcycle parking, the use of motorcycles is obviously a natural consequence of the lack of parking facilities that are actually available for powered two-wheeler users.

Clearly, attempts by the boroughs to restrain powered two-wheeler use have failed, with this now impacting on cycle facilities. Boroughs need to set aside much of what can only be described as, or interpreted as, 'institutional negativity' towards powered two-wheelers that is based largely on old stereotypes, and start to facilitate reduced vulnerability for initiatives to improve factors and security for powered two-wheeler users, which includes more parking spaces. MCI has not really looked at this motorcycle use of cycle-only lanes, but we would support the cyclists' lobby in saying that we would not like to see that actually happening.

On a general note, clearly what is going on at the moment is showing some interesting results, not conclusive, but more positive than perhaps we would have been led to believe in the past. We remain mystified that there is so much time and vitriol spent on an anti-motor cycle campaign by the cycle lobby. We share so much in common. We are vulnerable road users; we face a road environment out there where we are trying to encourage decreased use of the car and increased use of other modes, and have much in common to share in the characteristics of our relative vehicles.

Papers have been produced based on conjecture, supposition, and strange theories. Let us work together on these issues; I think that has got to be the way forward. Suppositions of increasing risk to cyclists and pedestrians simply do not appear to be valid. TRL's Report 581, which is a scoping study of motor cycle accidents looks at different studies on motor cycle safety in order to try and bring some clarity to the whole debate on safety. But one study notes that, nationally, collisions between cyclists and powered two-wheelers occur only 0.9% of the time in built-up areas, and involved around 152 collisions in built-up areas across the entire UK. This notes only 19 serious injuries and zero deaths.

The issue that powered two-wheeler use could create more congestion is an interesting one; I am not sure where it came from but it does not seem to be supported by any particular data. Also, we are worried that the blame for cyclists jumping red lights and cycling on pavements is being shifted onto motorcyclists. I fear that is not a very good thing to do at all. Once again, it is clear that we need to work together. The work that we and TRL have done seems to show that there is a broad mass of cyclists who are actually prepared to work with motorcyclists and do not appear to have problems with the shared use of facilities and seem to share the road quite happily. Our own observational study has shown cyclists and motorcyclists actually teaming up when it comes to car drivers invading bus lanes, which was quite an amusing thing to observe at the time.

I mentioned the conflict between cyclists and buses. I fear this is bus drivers getting rather frustrated. I would really advise you to take a good look at this study; I think there is work that needs to be done with bus drivers and, in turn, additional facilities for cyclists created in order to try and reduce risk to cyclists on the through corridor routes.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): Thank you very much Craig. Yes, there has been a great deal of vitriol and that is how it first passed across most of our e-mail screens; that is how we first became alerted to this disagreement.

Charlie Lloyd, London Cycling Campaign: The London Cycling Campaign represents the interests of about 650,000 regular cyclists in London. I am also speaking with the support of the cyclists' national group, the Cyclists' Touring Club, and the Cyclists' Public Affairs Group and also the Road Danger Reduction Forum.

Firstly, we do not have a lot of animosity to motorcyclists in general. Our opposition to increasing use of motorcycles is based on their safety record in the whole of the transport infrastructure and mix. Our concern is that these trials are a precursor to opening up all bus lanes to motorcycles, whether they are just on Transport for London roads. If any borough does not agree, it will be impossible to enforce, if one borough has a different set of rules to any other borough or from the London-wide roads.

One of the results of this opening up bus lanes to motor cycles is to, quite obviously, increase capacity on those roads for motor cycles and taking some of the motor cycles out of the car lanes increases capacity for cars. As we know, anywhere that increases capacity on regular routes will increase usage and consequently increase congestion of motorcycles and cars. We think this can only be seen in the wider context of all London's traffic. Given that motor cycles are the most dangerous mode of transport on the roads, increasing their numbers, we believe, increases the danger on the roads overall.

We do have some anecdotal evidence submitted; we have anecdotal remarks from cyclists, some of whom find motor cycles in bus lanes or motor cycles overtaking from behind quite distressing. There is some evidence that this may deter people from using cycles in London.

Currently, the situation, I think David (Rowe) described it, on bus lanes is that motor cycles use bus lanes illegally and, whenever the congestion crops up and when the car traffic slows to almost to almost stopping, we find that about 90% of motor cycles will move into the bus lane, better described as 'nipping in' or 'nipping out'. Generally, in my observation, they quite cautiously get back into the legal area as soon as possible. Our concern is that, where they are given open access to the wide whole length of the bus lane, they will ride, and some people have commented on this, they tend to ride faster, not illegally fast, but much faster than they would be riding within the flow of congested traffic.

The motorcycle group argue that it is safer for them to be in these lanes, and we find it hard to believe that, if they are travelling faster and over a long distance, how this is safer. We had the question before about speed and the cause of accidents and, as far as we are aware, although the cause of accidents is very difficult to determine, but when a vehicle is going faster the outcome in terms of severity of injury and the likelihood of death is much higher. There is an exponential relationship between speed and severity of casualty.

In these couple of pages from the London Road Safety Unit's latest survey of road casualties, and this is what Craig (Carey-Clinch) was referring to when he said that motorcycle accidents were down, I would like to draw your attention to the table on page two. I think Craig (Carey-Clinch) said that the table on page one would show the decline in motorcycle accidents over six months. On page two we have the figures for all road users compared to the base line in 1994 to 1998 for killed and serious injury accidents, and this is the target that the Mayor and the Government have set and in this case all of the different modes of road user travel, all their casualty figures, in terms of killed and serious injuries have declined by about 25%, except for motor cycles, which have gone up 33% against the base line.

Craig's figures about the decline in accidents refer to all accidents. If you look at these figures, which are for a very short period admittedly and perhaps not representative, but over the period of these figures the fatalities for motor cycles went up and serious injuries for motor cycles went up, although overall injury levels did go down.

I think it is inadequate to rely on small sets of data like this for a general period. It is perhaps inadequate, and David (Rowe) want an extension to the trial to get more data, even, we believe, relying on free bus lanes data for 18 months or three years will not give you the whole picture of what is going to happen. If the data is restricted to what happens on these lanes, or on control lanes as well, it does not give you the picture of the increased motorcycle traffic resulting from this kind of experiment. Increased motorcycle traffic across all of London will increase the danger level across all of London, and that is our great concern. That is perhaps seen as the [inaudible] concerns.

Another note on the statistics. The statistics most people talk about are the casualties to particular road user groups, either to cyclists or to motor cycle riders. We are also concerned about, for example, the casualties to pedestrians, where long-term data shows that motorcycles are involved in a far higher proportion of casualties to pedestrians than all other modes of transport. These are the figures that will not show up at all in any short-term or restricted study. This is perhaps another area of vitriol that has been flying around the e-mails of most of the people in this room for several months now.

When I say there is a likelihood of an increased risk to pedestrians from increased motor cycle use, you should be aware that by pedestrians we really mean bus users, bus passengers, underground passengers and rail passengers – they are the bulk of pedestrians when you are talking about transport in London.

On other facilities, advanced stop lines, stop lights and cyclists' [inaudible], as they are called, cyclists have found these quite beneficial, they like them, they make a cyclist visible to other traffic coming from behind, and it is traffic coming from behind which is the biggest risk to cyclists. Motorcyclists do not suffer as much risk from traffic coming behind. 80% of motorcycle crashes happen when a motorcycle runs into something in front. It is not necessarily, as said in the TRL report that David (Rowe) quoted, the motorcyclist's fault, but what happens is that they run into things much more than they are run into by other people. We find that the use of advanced stop lines can, in some of the busy areas, crowd out cyclists, who are forced back into the mix of other traffic, and in other areas it can intimidate cyclists.

Finally, on the use of other facilities, cycle paths, in the evidence from the London Borough of Merton and in my submission there are examples of cycle lane facilities that have been built and, as a result of use by motor cycles, the highway authorities involved have had to put up barriers to stop motor cycles using them, and this has caused a great deal of inconvenience, a lot of cost and it diminishes the benefit of those routes to cyclists and pedestrians, and it is perhaps that, once the barrier is up, you do not measure any motor cycles there, but it is a disbenefit of increased motor cycle use in London.

To sum up the remarks I made: based on the long-term knowledge that we have of the dangers of motor cycles, we do think the actual trial of motor cycles in bus lanes is not a good idea and we think to make that permanent and widespread would be a very bad idea.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): Thank you.

Roger Evans (AM): Thank you both for your evidence. Mr Lloyd, most of what you have said to us today is the sort of thing that we could well have heard from people who do not particularly represent cyclists. Your argument against motorcycling seems to be that it is a bad thing *per se* and we should seek to adopt policies to discourage it, very much as your argument would be about cars. Could you tell us a bit more about the relationship that cyclists have with motorcyclists and why it is that they seemingly find it so difficult to work together? Because I, as someone who uses neither cycling transport very much, would have thought you might have a lot in common.

Charlie Lloyd, London Cycling Campaign: We do have a lot in common as being described as vulnerable road users, in the sense that in an accident situation, basically the heavier the vehicle, or the lighter the vehicle or person, the more likely they are to suffer injury. So pedestrians are worse off than any other mode of transport; cyclists are worse off – cyclists do present some danger to pedestrians – but heavier modes of transport cause greater danger to cyclists and motorcyclists.

I think that is what we have in common. Where perhaps some of our discontent with motorcyclists lies is that we do not agree with their claims to be a green form of transport or to be much of an improvement compared to the private motorcar in terms of pollution and in terms of the health effects of pollution and noise.

Roger Evans (AM): Yes, but to be fair, that is a view, albeit I do not agree with it, it is a view that many people from different organisations could hold and come in front of us and give us. What can you tell us though about the actual use of bus lanes by motorcycles? How does that impact on the interests of cyclists? Is it something which actually would discourage cyclists in using bus lanes, or might they not be a problem to you?

Charlie Lloyd, London Cycling Campaign: Anecdotal evidence we have from our members is that they are frightened by motor cycles coming up from behind, generally going quite fast, and by quite fast I might be talking about 20mph or 30mph – quite legal speeds but in a congested situation when the rest of the traffic is only doing 5-6mph any vehicle doing 25-30mph is perceived as quite frightening. So the effect is to discourage cyclists.

In terms of actual measured casualties the figures are so small that this is hard to determine. Despite what Craig said, in the study period there has been, to my knowledge, at least one cyclist killed by a motor cycle. Not on a bus lane, on Blackfriars Bridge, but this is, happily, a very rare event, but it is very frightening to cyclists.

Roger Evans (AM): But in bus lanes you are going to encounter buses, which are very large and will be travelling at those sorts of speeds, and you are going to be encountering black cabs and other authorised users of bus lanes, which will also be travelling at those sorts of speeds and present more of a threat, surely?

Charlie Lloyd, London Cycling Campaign: Generally, large vehicles in bus lanes do not overtake cyclists at that kind of speed. A bus is stopping and starting and stopping at stops, and cyclists travel at much the same speed as the bus. I agree with Craig (Carey-Clinch) that generally in the roads there are problems with bus drivers and cyclists and a lot of us know there is a very large problem with heavy goods vehicles and cyclists. But it is the speed differential with motor cycles because there is more space or more likelihood that they will overtake and that they do not slow down. Generally, a bus or taxi does not overtake a cyclist at much speed in a bus lane on a bit of a road that is not...

Roger Evans (AM): You are talking about overtaking within the same lane, effectively, as being a problem?

Charlie Lloyd, London Cycling Campaign: Within or crossing over. A taxi or a bus, when they are overtaking a cyclist and the outside lane is clear, then they will move into the general traffic lane. If the outside lane is not clear it depends crucially on the width of the bus lane. On a four-metre bus lane there is very little problem; on a 2.5 metre or 2.6 metre bus lane, there is potentially conflict between buses and cyclists.

Roger Evans (AM): I am not familiar with this element of the Highway Code, but is someone on a motor bike who overtakes a cyclist or indeed another motor bike in the same lane in breach of the law? Should they move out into an outside lane?

Charlie Lloyd, London Cycling Campaign: No, not at all. I am just talking about the practical road space issues and what happens when one vehicle overtakes another. Generally motorcycles are perceived to come from behind at a higher speed than other vehicles in bus lanes.

Val Shawcross (AM): Craig (Carey-Clinch) used the term 'institutional negativity' about some public organisations' attitude to the bike. In a sense, I would like to throw that back to David (Rowe) and say that what is not clear in any of this to me is what TfL's road user hierarchy is, i.e. most of the boroughs say very explicitly as a matter of public policy: pedestrian, cyclist, public transport and then motorised users.

TfL has a long-term plan to try and pull people out of cars and put them onto the more environmentally friendly modes of transport, including the legs. Where do you see powered two-wheeled transport sitting in your policy hierarchy, in terms of long-term aims as Transport for London? Certainly, the impact of TfL policy so far has been to incentivise and increase the amount of powered two-wheelers on the road. Is that an explicit decision and how does it fit in with the long-term aim of reducing car use?

David Rowe, TfL: TfL has clear policies to promote the use of walking, cycling and public transport. Above all, in terms of our hierarchy, safety is our primary objective. While we are not promoting motor cycle use, we are keen to facilitate safe motor cycle use, and therefore it is beholden upon us to look at where there are opportunities to improve motor cycle safety, and the potential use of bus lanes is a potential area where we felt it was appropriate to go forward with the pilots to help us understand whether this could benefit motor cycle safety.

Val Shawcross (AM): So in terms of the car, where would you place the powered two-wheeler in relation to it? Is it better, worse or co-equal, from a public policy point of view?

David Rowe, TfL: I think there are clear advantages of the motor cycle over the car. They are a much more fuel-efficient form of transport; they are a relatively low-cost form of transport; they take up less road space. But the safety issues are a major concern to TfL and the Mayor, and that is the issue we are looking to tackle with these pilots.

Val Shawcross (AM): So you are saying basically that there is not a background policy view on whether or not a powered two-wheeler journey is better or worse than a car journey?

David Rowe, TfL: I think we see that there are advantages of the motorcycle over the car, but there are these safety considerations.

Val Shawcross (AM): Would you put safety considerations as a more important consideration to environmental and road space impact or not?

David Rowe, TfL: I think safety is at the top of any hierarchy in terms of transport, be it on the railway or on the road. It has got to be the number one priority.

Val Shawcross (AM): In which case, therefore, you would be saying that a car journey is a safer journey than a powered two-wheeler?

Okay, we would like some clarity in this area, and I accept, David, that you have got a particular project; you not responsible for all TfL, but maybe there is a bigger issue about whether or not TfL has made its mind up about powered two-wheelers.

Can I turn back to Craig, Charlie, Cathy and Gerard, regarding this issue I asked about earlier? Is it a red herring? Is there a different impact, and should we be looking at the below 50cc powered two-wheelers differently from the powerful, heavy motorcycles? Or is it sensible to talk about them in one great big bag?

Craig Carey-Clinch, Motor Cycle Industry Association: I think it is worth looking at the different types. One of the things we are very concerned with at the moment is safety. Charlie has made a few points about it and so has everybody else. The vulnerability that one faces on a motorcycle is pretty high and the comparative figures are quite frightening. Even though the casualty rate for motorcyclists is now the lowest for 10 year, there is still a wide variance between that and car users, for example.

We are doing a lot of research, some of it at European level, which does actually look at the different sizes of vehicles, and I think when it comes to devising policies further down the line then certainly we can look at what impacts best of different types of motor cycling. But there is only a little really known about the different types. That is the problem we have got – a lack of information. We are currently lobbying government at the moment to do some in-depth research into the characteristics of different types of, not just rider and experience, but also types of bike that people are falling off of.

What we do know, though, is that the bulk of the increase in casualties in recent years is rural casualties on larger motorcycles, leisure motor cycling, not the urban context so much. In London, as we know, casualty figures are looking fairly good, with the Congestion Charge there we are looking at increased motor cycling coupled with fewer casualties, which really bucks a national trend. My feeling is that London is getting it right but we still need to know more about types of accident and types of vehicles.

Graham Tope (AM): Just following on that theme, Chair, I rode a motor cycle for years and years, everything from 50cc up to 500cc, and just anecdotally I certainly felt – whether I was or not I do not know – much safer on the larger bikes than I did on the smaller ones.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): Interesting.

Graham Tope (AM): That is experience – a bit of my past you did not know.

Val Shawcross (AM): What about the people you knocked over, though?

Graham Tope (AM): I never, never knocked anyone over.

Val Shawcross (AM): I know you didn't.

Graham Tope (AM): Incidentally, I was hit more often from the rear or the side than I ever was hitting anything, but that is also anecdotal. I have quite forgotten what I was going to ask now.

I have been fascinated by this discussion about whether or not cyclists are more at risk with motor cycles authorised in a bus lane, and I stress 'authorised' because people weaving in and out is different. It would seem to me that cyclists would be actually more at risk, if you like, more intrusive, from buses and taxis, which obviously nobody is suggesting should be banned from the bus lane, but nevertheless they are, than from motorcyclists.

I am just asking if cyclists know that motorcyclists are authorised to be using the bus lane, is that not going to be safer for both the cyclist and the motorcyclist than the alternative, which I think usually happens in London congested traffic, where motorcyclists and sometimes cyclists as well weave in and out of the traffic, rather than sitting in the queue with all the cars? It is one of the benefits of riding a motorcycle that you can do that. So is it not better to have them on a dedicated highway, and for all users of that dedicated bus lane to know that they are authorised to use it?

Cathy Phillpotts, British Motorcyclists' Federation: Certainly, I think that having motor cycles in the bus lane means that pedestrians waiting to cross the road can see a motor cycle coming, whereas they may not see the motor cycle if it is filtering between other lanes of traffic. So there is a potential advantage for pedestrians crossing the road.

I think also that there is an advantage to motor cycles and buses because of the reduction of weaving and the reduction of vehicles wiggling across to other lanes, because the motorcyclists in the bus lane can see the cyclist from well further back and can take appropriate action, slow down and move further over in the lane.

Charlie Lloyd, London Cycling Campaign: I think the current situation is that cyclists do expect motorcyclists to be weaving in and out of bus lanes at the point when you are coming up to traffic lights when the congestion stops. So it is hard to determine a difference on the trial sites to other bus lanes where this happens regularly every morning and evening and cyclists are aware of it.

In those situations, and as reported on the A23 by some of our users, they find knowing that motor cycles are going to be in those bus lanes all the time for the whole length of the bus lane actually more distressing than knowing that the motor cycles are going to be in there at the pinch points when they are to come past. It is very difficult because with such a small trial area, any statistics we have are going to be totally unreliable – that is our main worry about this.

Craig Carey-Clinch, Motor Cycle Industry Association: I think there is a point here regarding the use of the term 'conflict'. This came up when we were looking into some research done into the Newham experiment into advanced stop line access for motorcycles. There was a room of us looking at video footage and some people were saying 'that is conflict'; other people were saying 'that is normal use and interaction of vehicles in traffic'.

I think the definition of conflict is subject to wide variance, depending on which particular viewpoint you are looking at. I have actually made a note here somewhere that one of the things I think we need to be looking at is some kind of proper definition as to what constitutes conflict, in order to inform some of the research that is going on. Otherwise, I think we are always going to have a bit of conflict about how we actually interpret the whole issue. I think that needs looking at. That is just a general point really.

Roger Evans (AM): It would be interesting, I think, and perhaps Transport for London can help here, beyond the trial, is there any variance between the number of accidents between motorcyclists and cyclists, and the number of accidents between cyclists themselves? Does the fact that these vehicles are powered actually make them much different to vehicles which are not powered, at the end of the day?

David Rowe, TfL: In the levels of casualties?

Roger Evans (AM): In the level of collisions. Obviously, there may be differences in the level of casualties, because the speeds will be different, but in the actual level of collisions.

David Rowe, TfL: The number of overall collisions for motor cycles is greater than for cyclists and, as you say, because they are travelling at higher speeds the severity of those casualties is greater as well.

Roger Evans (AM): But do motorcyclists hit cyclists any more often than other cyclists do? Maybe your figures are not statistically representative of the number of cases...

Graham Tope (AM): Presumably when cycles hit each other, they do not usually, thank goodness, cause personal injury and get the call-out.

David Rowe, TfL: We only get the personal injury accidents that are recorded by the police. Certainly, the figures that came back suggest that there is a higher incidence of motor cycles and cyclists in collisions rather than cyclists and cyclists.

Roger Evans (AM): That is statistically shown?

David Rowe, Transport for London: Yes.

Craig Carey-Clinch, Motor Cycle Industry Association: There is a conflict here in that as well. The STATS19 (police road traffic accident database) data seems to indicate otherwise, but Charlie (Lloyd) might come up with something which says otherwise. There is a lot of confusion in the data, which I think is why there is scope for something to be done on this.

Roger Evans (AM): I suppose the reason I make the point is, yes, it is obviously dangerous to have motorcyclists overtaking cyclists in one lane and possibly something which should be outlawed. But cyclists travel at different speeds and overtake each other in lanes as well, and they are quieter.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): It does strike me that we should bear in mind that as with policing, where people's fear of crime may be greater than their experience of it, so with people's experience on the road, people's sense of vulnerability because there is a loud machine going past them may well be considerably greater than the likelihood of them

actually being hit by it. So it is about public confidence and sense of safety, I guess, is as important as the statistical likelihood of being mowed down. That is something we need to deal with as a policy issue.

I was very interested in the point that Val (Shawcross) was developing, which is that, if I have got it right, TfL have been driven primarily by the relatively poor performance of accident statistics for powered two-wheelers in developing this policy, rather than by, if you like, a holistic policy towards motor cycles in London and what should be done with them. From a policy point of view there is almost a position that it would be quite nice if motor cycles did not exist, but the fact that they do exist means that they need to be managed in some sort of way, rather than, if you like, a positive policy, which says that they are an integral part of transport network in London. Is that a fair interpretation?

David Rowe, TfL: It is important to recognise that there is a range of other activities that we are doing that we are doing in relation to motor cycling, not simply looking at motor cycles in relation to bus lanes, but safety campaigns, the Bike Safe initiative to offer training for motorcyclists, and motor cycle parking on the street. It is not as though this is it in relation to motor cycles; it is part of a potential solution and it was important that we looked at whether it could offer those benefits.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): I appreciate that you are probably not in a position to give Bob Kiley's (Commissioner, Transport for London) answer to that question, but perhaps we could ask Mr Carey-Clinch or one of the other representatives from the motor cycling end of the business. Is it your view that the transport authorities see you as an evil to be tolerated, rather than a positive part of the transport network?

Craig Carey-Clinch, Motor Cycle Industry Association: It does depend from local authority to local authority. The problem with motor cycling is that it has suffered enormously from stereotyping, and legislation, particularly back in the 1980s, sought to reduce motor cycling from making accessibility to it even higher. The problem was that they failed to deal with vulnerability and the training and continued improvement of motor cycle use and safety in the post-test phase.

Of course, once motor cycling became popular again, all the accidents came back, and because the incentives or the opportunity was lost to incorporate some mainstream motor cycling and transport policy, there was little incentive for manufacturers particularly to market to the commuter sector. So by the time the mid-1990s came around, all the growth was in the leisure sector, and this is where the main bulk of the accidents are actually concentrated.

TfL, I do believe, has broken a mould and moved from institutional negativity to perhaps institutional caution, I think is probably the best way of describing it.

Val Shawcross (AM): It is confusion rather than caution.

Craig Carey-Clinch, Motor Cycle Industry Association: I think the basic case is that there is a case for motor cycles as an alternative to the car, which is being tested at this moment before decisions can be finally made, mainly by the Government's advisory group for motor cycling. Government has also developed this institutional caution. But at local authority level we are still seeing a case of 'oh my God, motor cycles, dirty, noisy, smelly, dangerous, got to get rid of them'.

I believe that that approach is increasingly being shown as a self-fulfilling prophecy: 'Motor cycles are dangerous, do not cater for them'. Therefore, the vulnerability aspects remain, casualties remain unsustainably high, and the local authority turns round and says 'yes, we were right not to promote motor cycling'. We need to change, I think. The same attitude existed towards cycling 25 years' ago, and look what has been done for cycling, which has helped to reduce vulnerability and encourage that mode of transport. The same thinking needs to be applied to motorcycling.

Finally, people have introduced initiatives to make motor cycling safer, such as access to bus lanes and decent secured parking, so motorcyclists do not have to go hunting around because there are plenty of parking spaces to go to, decent road safety initiatives, and incorporation in mainstream transport policy. The mistake is viewing those as ways to promote motorcycling; what it is actually doing is helping to make motor cycling safer and less vulnerable. That is really the big thinking shift that I think needs to take place.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): One of the helpful conclusions from this piece of work might be for us to suggest that TfL needs to develop, if you like, a more holistic policy on motorcyclists and their role in London, rather than just looking at this particular issue. I think that might be quite productive.

I have a couple of other questions: do motorcyclists receive large numbers of fixed penalty notices for speeding? Do speed cameras catch motor bikes regularly?

Craig Carey-Clinch, Motor Cycle Industry Association: I have not collected the data, but I would imagine that they would have their fair share as well as any other...

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): Or are their number plates so small that they tend to slip through?

Craig Carey-Clinch, , Motor Cycle Industry Association: A question for the police, I think.

David Rowe, TfL: They are required to have standard size number plates; I do not have the statistics to hand.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): Because it strikes me, that is a somewhat tangential approach, that, if we are to allow particular classes of road users to use bus lanes, then we perhaps need to think a little bit more about the rules that they should follow when they are using those lanes. If you use it as a way of undertaking, the opposite of overtaking, traffic by speeding in a bus lane, then that is not really acceptable, I think, to most Londoners. It should be within the speed limit, and there should be perhaps some thinking about giving way to buses and cyclists and so on. Have any of you given any thought to the sort of rules which should be perhaps thought through before we roll out this initiative?

Craig Carey-Clinch, Motor Cycle Industry Association: The observation work that we have done indicates that there is a fair amount of speed regulation through shared use, and the minority of road users that go fast, as you get with every road user type, tend to not use the bus lane. That is something we have noticed. Our research really asks questions as well which still need further testing, and I would certainly like a better research body to look at that point. But I think the basic points you are making we would certainly agree with. Road users need to share the road, I think is the bottom line, in a positive and sensible way.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): Without getting into the bureaucracy of getting the Government to change the Highway Code, for example, or the Road Traffic Acts, are TfL looking at ways in which rules might be developed to assist the safe use of bus lanes by motorcycles?

David Rowe, TfL: In terms of bus lanes, at the moment it is been on the trial stage clearly, but initiatives such as the Bike Safe bike training course that we run with the Metropolitan Police are very much focussed around motorcyclists' behaviour and use of the road. Similarly, the campaigns that we run, the one that is running in cinemas and on television at the moment, in terms of motor cycles looking out for other car users and car users looking out for motor cycles, are very much aimed at those activities, and it may well be something that we do need to step up our activity on in the future.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): I do not think cyclists get off scot-free. I get quite a lot of post and I am sure other Members do from residents complaining about badly behaved cyclists. I get loads of post about that, and indeed the same issues come up with motorcycles. I think that the wider public in London would be more satisfied if there was greater energy put into enforcing good behaviour and there were better expectations of good behaviour.

There is obviously a resource issue there, because, provided there are not accidents, it may be seen as a victimless crime, but I think from a general Londoner's point of view, the concept of a victimless crime on the road does not really exist.

A final provocative question: do you have a view on speed limiters on motor-cycles and whether they might help to enforce better behaviour? I suspect this is a sort of Holy Grail issue for the motor cycle lobby, but Londoners would find it quite reassuring, I think, if for example bikes were regulated so they could not go above, say, 40mph in a bus lane, or maybe 30mph.

Craig Carey-Clinch, Motor Cycle Industry Association: We are looking at a whole issue of wider technology through powered vehicle use anyway. I know in the States certainly the trucks have now got them pretty much all the time, and we are starting to see more of them. But I think the issue for motor cycling is the application of such devices on a two-wheeled vehicle creates certain technological and road safety problems which have yet to be resolved. So I would suggest that opinion varies from actively hostile to completely unconvinced. Do you want to add anything to that?

Cathy Phillpotts, British Motorcyclists' Federation: If you are leaning going round a bend and the speed limiter cuts in at that point, the chances are at the moment that you would fall off. If a speed limiter suddenly decided you are in a 40mph limit and you can go faster, and the vehicle therefore surges forward, because what you are doing with the throttle would make no difference. If there was a speed limiter governing your speed, the chances are you could surge forward. If you surge forward the bike would come upright, it would take a different line. So there are a number of safety arguments there.

John Biggs (Deputy Chair): There are speed limiters already, I think. Anecdotally, there is a kid down my street who got a moped for his 16th birthday and I think it is regulated so it will not...

Cathy Phillpotts, British Motorcyclists' Federation: That is maximum speed, rather than something that technology provides. A lot of the smaller mopeds only do 28mph. The smallest category is restricted.

Val Shawcross (AM): That is why I was asking whether or not there ought to be a different policy approach for the smaller ones to the larger ones, and nobody really said yes or no.

Gerard Livett, Greater London Motorcycle Action Group: I think that would actually be very difficult to enforce. If you have a situation where only mopeds, for example, are allowed in bus lanes, how do you define what a moped is? We appreciate there is a definition of a moped, but maybe someone on a 125cc scooter might think 'oh, that means me'.

Lynne Featherstone (Chair): Right, no one ever said it was easy. Are there any other questions? No? Well, thank you for that interesting range of views. I do not know what conclusions we will come to; as I said, the judgement of Solomon, but thank you very much for coming today.