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1. Introduction & Background

- **The Vision Zero approach to road danger reduction and road safety** originates in Sweden and mandated the government to manage and design the nation’s streets and roads with the ultimate goal of preventing fatalities and serious injuries¹. The legislation establishing this approach was approved in the Swedish Parliament in October 1997.

- **A Vision Zero approach has now been adopted in many parts of the world** including cities such as New York², San Francisco³ (see Appendix 1 for more detail on these cities), Portland Oregon⁴, Boston and Chicago.

In London a motion was passed in the Greater London Assembly in December 2015⁵ calling on the Mayor to adopt the Swedish Vision Zero approach to road danger, which incorporates **Five Key Principles:**

- **Safety**: road traffic systems should take account of the fact that people make mistakes and should minimise both the opportunity for error and the harm done when they do occur.

- **Ethics**: human life and health have highest priority.

- **Responsibility**: those who design and manage road systems share responsibility with road users.

- **Mechanisms for change**: We must all be ready to change to achieve safety.

- **Active travel**: a mode shift to encourage healthy forms of transport such as cycling and walking.

- **This approach has now been adopted by the new Mayor’s administration in London** which stated in its City for All Londoners consultation document⁶ that “No loss of life is inevitable or acceptable” and that the Mayor will adopt a 'Vision Zero' approach to road safety, which puts “the elimination of road danger at the very heart of the transport system”.

⁴ [https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/392146](https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/392146)
⁶ [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/city_for_all_londoners_nov_2016.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/city_for_all_londoners_nov_2016.pdf)
Our proposals envisage a number of elements:

- Recognising that the cause of road danger is the presence of vehicles and these have the potential to do great harm in built-up areas where people want to be.
- Reducing the dominance of motor vehicles on our streets to minimise the dangers they pose to vulnerable road users.
- Reducing the volume of motor traffic.
- Promoting the number of residential 20mph-speed-limit areas.
- Improving bus design.
- Working with industry to make lorries safer.
- Considering the implications of driverless cars.

Our report outlines what effective Vision Zero policies might look like in London and what sort of approaches are needed to redress the imbalance between vehicles and people in London where, in the most recently reported full year of 2015, 136 people were killed (of whom 55% were pedestrians or cyclists) and a further 1,956 were seriously injured (of whom 53% were pedestrians or cyclists).

Over the past 10 years, rapidly improving levels of safety for those travelling in vehicles have meant that the proportion of those killed or seriously injured on London’s roads who were in a car has fallen from 27% in 2005 to 15% in 2015.

2. Vision Zero for London

The starting point for Vision Zero is a recognition that people make mistakes and that the road environment needs to take account of this. Although there is a place for education to encourage people to behave in ways that reduce danger, this cannot be relied upon. It is the responsibility of the authorities to design the streets and roads and the regulatory regime to keep them safe from the danger of death or serious injury.

THIS DOCUMENT: We set out here possible approaches in relation to:

1. Vision Zero as an Umbrella for Road Danger Reduction Policies
3. Designing London’s Streets for Vision Zero
4. The Role of Lower Speed Limits and 20mph
5. Vehicle Design and New Technology
6. Enforcement
7. Collision Investigation
8. Building public awareness of Vision Zero

We will assess each area in terms of feasibility and, where known, the impact that each is likely to have on casualty levels.
3. The Approaches

3.1. Vision Zero as an Umbrella for Road Danger Reduction Policies

An advantage of Vision Zero is that it offers a way to bring together all of the activities that cover road danger reduction and road safety into a single body of policy, activity and performance. This manifests itself in a number of ways in the approaches cities have taken.

- In New York, a single website Vision Zero View\(^7\) brings together data on crashes, proposed and implemented street design changes and speed limits into a single location of easy-to-use and read maps.

- In San Francisco, all reporting of enforcement activity is held in a single location\(^8\) (this will be looked at in more detail as part of enforcement activity).

- Promotional campaigns can be undertaken in a long-term brand-consistent fashion as part of a Vision Zero for London that people can become familiar with over time. At present in London, there is little to indicate that the approach to road safety is joined up – each successive TfL Road Safety initiative has a different name. There is no consistency of reporting in the enforcement work of the Metropolitan Police even though considerable work is being done. Vision Zero creates an opportunity to bring all of these constituent elements together in one place and have a far greater consistency in reporting, targets, branding and promotion.

- Transportation Alternatives in its June 2011 report which sees Vision Zero\(^9\) as a “unifying vision” that “has successfully been used in other countries and cities as a means of building broad support. A vision motivates key partners and stakeholders and may capture the imagination of the general public, thereby generating the momentum for system-wide change.”

- The same report quotes Joerg Beckman of the European Transport Safety Council as saying Vision Zero “provides a stimulator and motivator and brings groups and individuals together around a common objective.”

3.2. Reducing Motor Vehicle Volumes in London

Although the link between the number of casualties and motor vehicle volumes is complex, a reduction of vehicle volumes in a densely populated and heavily used urban environment is likely to have a beneficial impact on casualty numbers (especially if vehicle speeds are not allowed to increase if traffic becomes more free flowing). Motor vehicle volume reduction should, therefore, be part of a Vision Zero approach and the policies proposed in the City for All Londoners\(^10\) consultation document – which emphasise the link between the presence of motor vehicles and road danger and the need to reduce the dominance of vehicle on London’s streets – indicates that reducing vehicle volumes is now seen as going hand in hand with reducing road danger and casualty numbers.

---

\(^1\) https://www.nycvzv.info/

\(^2\) http://sanfranciscopolice.org/traffic-stats


\(^4\) https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/city_for_all_londoners_nov_2016.pdf
London-wide road pricing, in a system fair to all Londoners introduced across the whole of London 24/7 would reflect the real costs of driving and help reduce traffic volumes and casualty numbers as well as creating an environment that would strong support increased levels of walking and cycling.

At a local level, there is evidence that Liveable Neighbourhood policies can also deliver casualty reductions. Although great care must be taken of the data, early results based on the first nine months of operation of the Walthamstow Village mini-Holland scheme found that there had been no reported traffic accidents in the Village area between September 2015 and April 2016 compared to the 15 recorded crashes on roads in the area in the three years prior to its launch.11

Fuller investigation is needed but there are potentially significant casualty benefits in reducing traffic volumes and targeting local interventions that reduce the opportunities that vehicles have to cut through neighbourhoods.

3.3. Designing London’s Streets for Vision Zero

The design of streets is vital in reducing casualty levels. In New York, a wholly different approach is being taken to street design in its Vision Zero Streets programme.12 This acknowledges that “a city with streets that encourage speeding, limit space for pedestrians, treat transit-users like second class citizens and force bike riders into danger will not reach zero – in fact, it will be enabling dangerous behaviour”.

Research shows that changes to street design can reduce casualty numbers. The New York website outlines two examples of an integrated approach being taken to reducing casualties:

- The introduction of a protected bike lane, pedestrian islands, and split-phase signals installed on Ninth Avenue in Manhattan saw injuries to all street users fall by 58%.

- On First and Second Avenue in Manhattan, the introduction of protected bike lanes, dedicated bus lanes, and changes to signals saw injury crashes fall by 37% even though bike-traffic volumes increased by 177%.

The principles behind a Vision Zero approach mean that street design should have three core functions:

- Discourage speeding.

- Encourage walking, biking and/or public transit use.

- Provide accessibility to all, regardless of age or physical ability.

11 http://www.guardian-series.co.uk/news/14870219.Thousands_fewer_cars_are_using_roads_since_Mini_Holland_launch/?ref=mrb&ip=9

12 https://www.visionzerostreets.org/
These principles result in 10 elements of a Vision Zero street (which are by co-incidence remarkably similar to those proposed in relation to Healthy Streets in London):

1. **Compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Accessibility** (enabling pedestrian access by people of all abilities).
2. **Public Amenities** (installing wayfinding, benches, bus stops and shelters and greenery to enhance the public realm).
3. **Protected Bike Lanes** (note that bike lanes also reduce speeding by vehicles).
4. **Narrowed Motor Vehicle Lanes** (Reduce carriageway width to 10 or 10.5 feet to reduce speeding which is the driving behaviour most likely to injure or kill).
5. **Pedestrian Islands** (at least five feet on all two-way multi-lane streets).
6. **Wide Sidewalks** (no less than 8 feet of unobstructed width in order to encourage walking and reduce speeding).
7. **Dedicated Mass Transit Facilities** in order to provide effective alternatives for those who would otherwise drive in their vehicles.
8. **Signal-Protected Pedestrian Crossings**.
9. **Dedicated Unloading Zones**.
10. **Signal Retiming**. It is interesting to note the link between a change in speed limits and the logic of then altering signal timings; it is not clear if this has occurred across London.

### 3.3.1 Engineering Measures

There are a number of additional engineering elements that would help reduce road danger to, and intimidation of, those on foot and those cycling, and improve levels of compliance with speed limits:

- **Road capacity reduction and other engineering improvements**: For example, segregated cycle lanes and the removal of gyratory road systems.

- **Liveable Neighbourhoods**: The establishment of a system of ‘traffic cells’ that would concentrate through traffic on main roads, with residential roads becoming ‘access only’. Filtered permeability is one of the engineering measures involved. Initial research from the Mini-Holland scheme in Walthamstow has found that traffic levels on 12 key roads in the ‘village’ area of Walthamstow fell by 56% - 10,000 fewer vehicles a day\(^{13}\).

Although only 20-25% of road casualties occur on non-arterial roads in London, the numbers remain significant. Addressing casualties in residential neighbourhoods does not appear in the *Safe London Streets* document\(^{14}\).

In the City of Edmonton’s Vision Zero\(^{15}\), there is recognition of the significance of liveability and the role of neighbourhoods: ‘Safety will be further enhanced by addressing and reducing community short cutting [rat running], and through measures such as community signs, neighbourhood speed-reduction programs and other proven countermeasures.’

---


\(^{14}\) [http://content.tfl.gov.uk/safe-london-streets-our-approach.pdf](http://content.tfl.gov.uk/safe-london-streets-our-approach.pdf)

• **Removal of the centre white line on main roads:** TfL research\(^{16}\) has found that this approach can lead to a reduction in average speeds of up to 3mph. Other low cost initiatives include the 2D speed cushions that are currently being trialled on the TLRN (eg Southwark Street).

### 3.3.2. Focus on Town Centres

Extensive research by TfL shows that **town centres and high streets are a major source of danger to pedestrians and cyclists.** The Pedestrian Town Centre Pilot Project may provide a way of testing possible innovative approaches to reduce road danger and make these locations more attractive to people on foot. The significance of these town centre and high street locations where pedestrian activity is at its greatest should be recognised. And **engineering and enforcement efforts to reduce road dangers in these locations should be prioritised.**

This focus on town centres is already a clear target for TfL but, in the Vision Zero approaches of other cities, this is enhanced by encompassing improvements to junctions, crossings and speed management.

### 3.3.3. Street Design – Crossings

Improving facilities at junctions and crossings is vital if casualty levels are to be reduced. In the TfL **Pedestrian Safety Action Plan**\(^{17}\) research discovered that more than half (53%) of fatalities were linked to people being struck by a vehicle as they were crossing the road. New York City’s Vision Zero also found that almost half of all injuries to people walking occur in crosswalks and its plan aims to provide safety for those who need more time to cross the street by shortening crossing distances and adjusting signal timings. Detailed guidelines for crossings have been developed by Living Streets and in summary these are:

- **The maximum acceptable waiting time for pedestrians should be 30 seconds.** There are concerns that pedestrian waiting times in London have increased in recent years and can exceed even the maximum waiting time set out in LTN1/12 for pedestrian crossings.

- **The minimum crossing time must be based on a walking speed of 0.6m/sec** which is based on research carried out by University College London on walking speeds of older people and pedestrians with a disability. Crossing times on hills and steep cambers are longer for manual wheelchair users.

- **Staggered crossings should not be used.**

- **Use of Copenhagen/blended crossings.** This new approach, far more than untreated crossings or even raised tables, gives greater emphasis to pedestrian priority in appropriate locations and ensuring that drivers are more aware of the priority they must give to pedestrians who are crossing.

---


**3.3.4. Street Design – Junctions**

New York City’s Vision Zero outlines the types of improvements in junction design that would be made to reduce road danger for pedestrians and cyclists. ‘New crosswalks where people want to cross; Shorter crossing distances to pedestrian islands; Clearer lane markings; Additional signalization for turns; Designated space for buses, cyclists, drivers and pedestrians; Lane reduction to accommodate all street users while maintaining capacity; Shorter crossing distances.’

Although the *Safer London Streets* document referred to TfL’s Better Junctions programme, it did not outline the characteristics of junction design that should be adhered to in order to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety. This has been a problem with the development of the Better Junctions programme in the past because the imperative to maintain vehicle throughput has meant that those aspects of junction design that would benefit pedestrians have often not been incorporated in schemes when they are implemented.

**3.3.5. Street Design – Reducing Distraction**

There is a real danger that distractions to drivers will increase rather than decrease with the pressure on the Boroughs and TfL to increase revenue from sources such as overhead or roadside digital advertising displays. These should be prohibited where they can distract drivers and contribute to collisions that involve pedestrians and cyclists.

**4. The Role of Lower Speed Limits and 20mph**

The significance of vehicle speed and the ability of the human body to withstand the kinetic energy of a moving vehicle are at the heart of the Vision Zero approach to reducing road danger. In Sweden wherever cars and pedestrians or cyclists are forced to mix, speed limits are set low, at 30 kph, or 18.6 mph. This reduces the risk of a fatal accident to 10%, instead of 80% when the limit is 30 mph.\(^\text{18}\)

Where speeds are reduced to a maximum of 20mph, casualties fall by more than two-fifths. See the definitive study of the impact of 20mph zones, *20 mph Zones and Road Safety in London*,\(^\text{19}\) that TfL commissioned from the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine in 2009.

This study looked at casualties in the 399 zones which had been implemented in London between 1990-91 and 2007-08. It found that: “The time series regression analysis estimated a 42% reduction in all casualties within 20 mph zones compared with outside areas, adjusting for an annual background decline in casualties of 1.7% on all roads in London.”

Clearly, therefore, if London is able to make 20mph a genuine maximum speed on those streets and roads where people are out and about in significant numbers, 20mph speed limits offer the opportunity to deliver almost half of the reductions in casualty numbers needed if Vision Zero is to be a credible long-term target for road casualties.

---

19 http://www.bmj.com/content/339/bmj.b4469
A 20mph default speed limit (subject to considered exceptions for arterial roads) is called for inside the North and South Circular roads. As the map below illustrates, the vast majority of borough managed residential streets, high streets and town centres inside the North and South Circular are now subject to a 20mph speed limit. TfL’s Safe London Streets: Our Approach, in the section ‘Travelling Too Fast – 20mph pilots’, talks of trials of lower speed limits, but there has to date been no linkage with borough initiatives on 20mph limits to give a sense of an overall policy for London in relation to lower speed limits.

TfL’s 20mph pilots on the TLRN inside the North and South Circular are becoming so extensive that (subject to considered exceptions such as the elevated section of the Westway) a coherent 20mph policy covering both borough and TfL roads is now becoming possible. It is important to note that the piecemeal approach that London has taken to setting lower speed limits leaves it behind a number of UK cities (including for example Edinburgh and Birmingham) which are already setting 20mph as the default across the whole authority.

Understanding how to encourage compliance with 20mph limits is also becoming far better established as TfL is trialing a range of initiatives to increase compliance on those parts of the TLRN that now have 20mph limits.
London’s current speed limit policy, however, lacks the clarity and consistency of, for example, Paris where a 30kph limit has long been policy for an area (blue line below) three times larger than that of the London Congestion Charging Zone\(^{20}\) (green line below).

Working with the many London Boroughs that have already adopted 20mph speed limit and TfL offers London the opportunity to set a 20mph default (with considered exceptions for arterial roads) out to the North and South Circular roads (red line below). This would cover an area which is extremely densely populated and where almost all of the roads perform a place function as well as a movement function and incorporate an area in which an around four-fifths of casualties occur in London.

![Map showing speed limits in London](image)

5. Vehicle Design and New Technology

Various new technologies offer the opportunity in the longer term to remove sources of road danger. The most obvious example of this for Vision Zero, which invariably emphasises the relationship between vehicle speed and road casualties, is reducing the amount of driving that occurs above the speed limit. The results of the trial of Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) on buses from early in 2016 are extremely encouraging as they demonstrated that “all buses fitted with ISA remained within the speed limit 97-99 per cent of the time” and that “the trials were particularly effective when travelling through 20mph zones”\(^{21}\). This demonstrates that ISA has the capacity in the longer term to help deliver the maximum speed limits that are needed to reduce casualty numbers towards zero.

- **Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA):** TfL supports and is providing funding for the roll-out of Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) on all buses from 2017 onwards. To be effective in London, ISA should be extended to cover all vehicles over which TfL has a duty of care including Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles and Goods Vehicles and especially Heavy Goods Vehicles. TfL has not only regulatory oversight for taxis and lorries but a duty of care to those affected by their use. This is especially the case when these types of vehicles are over-represented in terms of casualties amongst vulnerable road users (pedestrians and cyclists).

\[^{20}\text{https://worldstreets.wordpress.com/2014/05/21/paris-to-limit-speeds-to-30-kmhr-over-entire-city/}\]
• **Emission standards:** In relation to air quality, TfL is proposing to stipulate standards for new vehicles looking to operate in London. The arguments appear strong for TfL to create a similar a regulatory framework for the commercial operation of vehicles in terms of how they comply with speed limits. For Vision Zero to be effective, TfL needs to set out the long term guidelines for mandatory adherence to speed limits.

• **Lorry design and other safety improvements:** Improvements to lorry design such as the Mayor’s proposals for Direct Vision cabs are essential to reduce danger to pedestrians and cyclists. Research has found that some 25% of pedestrian deaths and a far higher proportion of cyclist deaths result from collisions with HGVs. Improving the design and safety of HGVs has an extremely high potential for casualty reduction.

• **Autonomous Vehicles:** It is important for road safety in London that the UK government ensures autonomous vehicles have mandatory compliance with the posted speed limit.

6. **Enforcement**

• **Wider Use of Camera Enforcement:** Sweden has one of the world's largest road camera networks and these have helped to raise speed-limit compliance from 50% to around 90% without their being perceived as having a revenue raising role. Camera technology can support Vision Zero policies:

  - In New York City at locations where they have been installed, Red Light Cameras have seen a 20% decline in all injuries, a 31% decrease in pedestrian injuries, and a 25% decrease in serious injuries in the three years after installation.

  - These cameras have also reduced illegal behaviour with the number of violations issued declining by 22% from 2010 to 2011.

  - In Washington DC average speeds at enforcement sites declined by 14% and the number of vehicles exceeding the limit by 10 miles per hour dropped by 82%.

  - Other cities which use speed cameras have reduced fatal and serious injuries by 30% to 40%.

• **Red Light Cameras:** The previous mayoral administration only envisaged the upgrading of Red Light Cameras rather than expanding the numbers of red light cameras and fixed speed cameras, and installing average speed cameras on some non-arterial roads (see Travelling too fast – Better technology). Red light cameras should be used more widely at locations in London where there are known to be problems with casualties, speeding and intimidation of those walking and cycling.

• **Average Speed Cameras:** Average speed cameras are extremely effective in increasing compliance with speed limits. Most recently data from the A9 in Scotland between Dunblane and Inverness found that the installation of average speed cameras had led to

---

26 http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-tayside-central-38458586
the total number of casualties falling by 45% (with the number of fatalities down 43% and serious injuries by almost 63%).

While the recent adoption of average speed cameras by TfL is welcome, the focus to date has been exclusively on multi-lane arterial roads such as the A40, A406, A316 and the A20.27

**Trials of average speed cameras are needed on non-arterial road locations in London.** In order to assess whether these cameras have a role in urban settings it would be valuable to undertake trials in locations with both 30mph and 20mph speed limits. Provided locations are chosen where there are relatively few entrances and exits, the impact of these cameras could be assessed. Appropriate locations could include particularly problematic streets identified in certain boroughs.

**The bridges across the Thames would also appear to be ideal locations** as they have just one entrance and exit for vehicles and are characterised by high vehicle speeds immediately adjacent to both extremely high volumes of pedestrians (Westminster Bridge, Waterloo Bridge and London Bridge) and many who are cycling. Not all average speed cameras require large gantries. Trials of less obtrusive cameras could overcome objections about the impact of cameras on the appearance of often historic structures.

- **Community Roadwatch:** The Community Roadwatch initiative is extremely welcome for a number of reasons: TfL, the Metropolitan Police and local communities working together; the clear indication that speeding is a serious issue for the police; and the role the community can play in identifying locations. It would be valuable to have an overview of the progress of the roll-out of CRW across London and how things are progressing in terms of a) which boroughs are running CRW events, b) how many CRW events are being run in each borough; c) how streets are being selected for CRW events; and d) the numbers of letters to registered vehicle owners being issued. A comprehensive programme of packaging and reporting enforcement activity could give a greater sense of the overall programme and its impact.

- **Enforcement in relation to particular offences:** We suggest an enhanced programme of enforcement particularly in relation to the following offences:
  - **Mobile phones being used by drivers.**
  - **Speeding.**
  - **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.
  - **Uninsured driving,** believed to be concentrated in certain boroughs.

---

• **What Enforcement focuses on:** Bringing together the different types of enforcement can make the whole feel like more than the sum of the parts. San Francisco has two approaches which might be of value to follow. Firstly its enforcement activity is targeted on those violations which have the greatest impact on collisions involving those on foot. San Francisco’s Focus on the Five\(^{28}\) approach to reporting enforcement states that: “Using multi-year collision data, the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) is focusing on enforcing the five violations that are most frequently cited in collisions with people walking. The goal is to have half their traffic citations be for these five violations.”

• **The Target Violations:** San Francisco sets out a list of those violations that it is most keen to target. They cover running red lights and stop signs, speeding, failure to yield while turning and cell phone usage. Other violations targeted by San Francisco include unlicensed drivers, not respecting a pedestrian’s right of way, suspended licenses, pedestrian offences, bike offences and other violations.

• **Parking control is seen as part of the overall role of Enforcement:** San Francisco adopts this approach. Its Parking Control Officers ‘enforce several parking violations to advance Vision Zero policy including double parking, blocking bicycle lanes, blocking sidewalks, and intersection gridlock.’

• **Reporting Enforcement Activity:** Another element which emphasises the overall Vision Zero approach is the way that San Francisco presents its reporting of enforcement activities.\(^{29}\) Monthly statistics (a simple one page arranged by offences and geographical area, with summaries across months for comparison) are published quickly after the end of the month. They make clear the volume of enforcement being done and allow it to be assessed against targets. They are also broken down by geographical areas to ensure that the appropriate resources are being given to each locality.

### 7. Collision Investigations

**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. TfL is committed to improving bus and lorry collision investigations, and this should be extended to all fatal and serious injury collision investigations.

The 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 required on an annual or six monthly basis. Great care is needed to guard against victim blaming in investigations of pedestrian and cyclist casualties.

\(^{29}\) [http://sanfranciscopolice.org/traffic-stats](http://sanfranciscopolice.org/traffic-stats)
8. Building public awareness of Vision Zero

Vision Zero provides an opportunity for a more unified and coherent approach to the development and presentation of the road safety policies to the public. As we have seen, Vision Zero aims to unify the work of street design and enforcement and offers significant opportunities for TfL and the Metropolitan Police to work together more closely.

In terms of promotion, Vision Zero can ensure that promotional campaigns target more clearly the sources of danger. In New York City, for example, one part of its Vision Zero promotion campaigning emphasises the importance of crossings and junctions: ‘Don’t Block the Box. When drivers block crosswalks because they can’t clear an intersection in time, they put people walking at greater risk. Don’t Block the Box is a campaign to cite drivers who block intersections and prevent pedestrians from crossing safely.’

Behavioural change campaigns have worked well when accompanying the introduction of 20mph speed limits (eg in Liverpool and Bristol). As 20mph speed limits become more widespread in London, the more those who drive will see that their own neighbourhood is benefiting from those who drive more slowly and that they themselves can contribute when they drive slowly through 20mph areas that others live in.

Contact. Living Streets: Tom Platt  
tom.platt@livingstreets.org.uk
20’s Plenty for Us: Jeremy Leach  
jeremy.l@20splenty.org
Appendix 1. New York City and San Francisco’s Overall Approach to Vision Zero

- The NYC and San Francisco VZ documents and approaches bring together the measures as an overall package of improvements that can easily be identified as having pedestrian and cyclist benefits. For example there is a summary pledge that within a specific timespan a set of changes will occur “NYC DOT will implement 50 safety intersection or corridor engineering projects in 2014; 25 arterial slow zones; 8 neighborhood slow zones; 250 speed bumps; Enhanced lighting at 1,000 intersections.”

- There is a clear description of how different types of places can be expected to change – “The Arterial Slow Zone program utilizes a combination of tools, including a lower speed limit, signal timing changes to discourage speeding, distinctive signs and enforcement by the NYPD to prevent traffic fatalities and improve safety on some of New York City’s most high crash streets. DOT adjusted signal timing along these corridors, making it consistent with the new speed limit while maintaining mobility on these heavily used corridors and preventing diversions to residential side streets.”

- ...and the impact of changes “NYC - At locations where NYC DOT has made major engineering changes since 2005, fatalities have decreased by 34 percent, twice the rate of improvement at other locations. NYC DOT will implement 50 safety intersection or corridor engineering projects in 2014”.

- As we have noted, the approach is packaged up into understandable pledges eg in relation to enforcement - Focus on the Five. Using multi-year collision data, the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) is focusing on enforcing the five violations that are most frequently cited in collisions with people walking.

- Reporting of progress is coherent and comprehensive and appears in VZ locations. For example there is a monthly summary of SFPD enforcement activity (http://sanfranciscopolice.org/traffic-stats) that ties in with the Focus on the Five pledges that are part of the VZ approach.