

Draft Plan for Policing & Crime in London: Consultation - Response from Living Streets & London Living Streets

This is a consultation response into the draft Policing & Crime Plan from Living Streets and London Living Streets. Living Streets is the national charity for everyday walking; London Living Streets is the local campaign arm of Living Streets. This is a joint briefing developed by London Living Streets in collaboration and with the support of the national organisation.

Overall we believe that (1) that road and pedestrian safety is important for meeting the Mayor's goal of 'keeping children and young people safe', as roads crashes are a major cause of death in children and young people; and (2) that road safety is also important for making London safer and fairer for all as poorer households are less likely to own motor vehicles but are more likely to be killed and injured in road collisions.

We would like to comment as follows in relation to the proposals outlined and in particular in relation to Vision Zero:

We are completely supportive of the processes outlined in the plan of agencies working together in partnership and of the ambition of the approach that the Metropolitan Police is contributing to of tackling road danger and aiming for far lower numbers of casualties.

Living Streets in conjunction with 20's Plenty for Us has prepared a report on the delivery of Vision Zero and the approaches that the evidence indicates can have a significant impact in reducing casualty numbers. Some of these approaches will lie in the hands of TfL and the GLA alone while others will require greater involvement and support from other bodies including the Metropolitan Police. The full report can be downloaded from:

https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/20splentyforus/pages/206/attachments/original/1487588307/DeliveringVisionZeroinLondon-LS_20sPI-20Feb17.pdf?1487588307

There are a number of elements in the report's proposals which we believe will require active delivery by the Metropolitan Police. Each of these are outlined in detail in the report noted above but are in summary:

6. Enforcement and in particular:

a) the wider use of **camera enforcement** which has been proven to deliver significant casualty savings. This would include greater numbers of red light cameras, fixed speed cameras and the use of (or at the very least trials of) average speed cameras in appropriate locations on non-arterial roads (ie with 20mph and 30mph limits).

b) An **enhanced programme of enforcement** with consistent and regular levels of enforcement across the 33 London boroughs of:

i. Mobile phones being used by drivers.

ii. **Speeding.**

iii. **Intimidation** by drivers of other road users. This is a significant deterrent to people's natural enjoyment and usage of London's streets and the assumption that "might is right" is a daily part of the experience of being a pedestrian and/or a cyclist in London. This behaviour has a resulting impact on the confidence that people have about walking and

cycling. Highway Code Rule 170, for example, which gives priority to pedestrians who have started to cross the road, is rarely adhered to. We would encourage the police to carry out specific pedestrian protection operations such as picking a junction and enforcing Rule 170, or picking a pedestrian crossing and enforcing no-stopping across it. As an example on the A10, there are cars parked across pedestrian crossings all the way from Hackney Road to London Bridge due to there being constant traffic jams. Even if this operation was just providing information to drivers and not a fixed penalty for driving without due care and attention there would be a value to such operations and it would signal a change in the way that pedestrians are being supported in London.

iv. Uninsured driving.

c) Reporting. We believe that there are benefits in improving and co-ordinating reporting procedures. For example San Francisco presents its reporting of enforcement activities in monthly statistics (a simple one page arranged by offences and geographical area, with summaries across months for comparison (sanfranciscopolice.org/traffic-stats)) which are published quickly after the end of the month. This can help ensure that there is greater consistency across the 33 boroughs and that types of enforcement and geographical areas that are not being addressed can be identified and addressed far more quickly.

7. Collision Investigations. 1) Understanding the lessons that can be learned from serious collisions can support the aims of Vision Zero if there are high quality collision investigations and a preparedness to implement their findings. Resources are needed to ensure that collision investigation becomes more of a priority for the Metropolitan Police. It is important for officers to believe that their recommendations will be implemented, including changes in street design.

2) Reporting the outcomes of their collision investigations. We understand that MPS does not report the outcomes of their collision investigations, even for fatal collisions. Thus it is not possible to know how often drivers are prosecuted or convicted for killing or injuring pedestrians including fatal hit and runs. Improved reporting is proposed on an annual or six monthly basis.

In addition there are elements of Vision Zero which to be effective will need to active support of the Metropolitan Police:

3.3.5. Street Design – Reducing Distraction. It is important that the police lobby to reject new elements that boroughs and TfL would like to introduce as part of the streetscape such as overhead or roadside digital advertising displays which are principally designed to gain the attention of drivers and as such act as a distraction to them.

4. Support for 20mph. The police have become far more supportive of 20mph speed limits in urban areas in the past few years and this is extremely welcome owing to the difference that lower vehicle speeds can make to casualty levels especially amongst those on foot and those who are cycling. With appropriate exceptions (on arterial roads) we would like to see the police consistently supporting 20mph limits in densely populated urban areas where there are likely to be large numbers of people on foot and travelling by cycle and the design of the road is appropriate for 20mph limits..

5. New Technology such as ISA. We would like to see support and encouragement from the Metropolitan Police for all of those measures which encourage compliance with speed limits especially when this is done in a way that does this automatically and avoids being a draw on police resources. We would, therefore, like to see active support for the widespread roll out of ISA to include London buses (which is currently planned), taxis and PHVs and goods vehicles. We want to see in the longer term technology delivering compliance with speed limits. A particular sector for installation of ISA is the Metropolitan Police's vehicle fleet as we understand that Berlin's police installed ISA some years ago, and that it reduced the numbers of collisions.

Finally and slightly more generally, we are keen that the Metropolitan Police become more supportive of **permeability** for those who are on foot and who are cycling in new developments. In the past there has been a perception that the police have discouraged permeability in new developments preferring cul-de-sacs to through walking routes perhaps in order to reduce crime. We feel that this view needs revision and that the whole agenda of Healthy Streets with its aim of connectivity for pedestrians is moving in favour of through routes and permeability for people on foot.

Jeremy Leach, Chair London Living Streets – 1st March 2017