**Citizens Jury – Cycling**

# General Process Overview

**Non-Government Expert Witnesses**

1. Associate Professor Bill Griggs – Director Trauma Services, Royal Adelaide Hospital
2. Steve Shearer, Executive Director – SA Road Transport Association
3. Penny Gale, General Manager, RAA
4. Michael Cornish, General Manager, Motor Accident Commission
5. Bob Fauser, SA Police
6. Professor Jennifer Bonham, Senior Lecturer Urban Geography Adelaide University
7. Tracey Gaudry & Mary Safe, Amy Gillett Foundation
8. Daniel Bennett, City Design and Transport Manager, Adelaide City Council
9. LGA President, David O’Loughlin
10. Christian Haag, Bike SA

**Government Expert Witnesses**

* Gemma Kernich, DPTI
* Andrew McKeegan – DPTI
* Carmel Williams – Health
* Chris Vanstone, TACSI

**Deliberation Days**: 2 x Full Days, 3 half days during October 2014

**Deliberation online:** 158 discussion threads, 124 files considered on private juror online portal.

## **Jurisdictions that the Jury looked to for research, approaches and learnings.**

* South Australia
* Queensland
* Sydney
* Hobart
* Melbourne
* London
* Germany
* Finland
* Sweden
* Copenhagen
* New York
* Vancouver
* And other insights from local government jurisdictions collected by jurors undertaking their own research.

## **Issues which triggered the most discussion/debate (in order)**

1. Speed & Traffic Flow
2. Improving cycling Infrastructure
3. High visibility
4. One metre rule
5. Knowing and understanding the road rules
6. Cycling on Footpaths
7. Education, Lane Markings, Media, Awards.

**Cycling on Footpaths Recommendation**

Final Recommendation: The Jury recommend that changes in legislation be made to allow cycling on footpaths when there is no safer alternative. As part of this recommendation it must be clear to cyclists, that they travel at low speeds and have enhanced consideration of pedestrians

## **How did this issue arise?**

1. The Jury were horrified at the deaths/serious injuries suffered in car vs bicycle collisions. Very often the cyclist suffered horrific injuries when colliding with a car, regardless as to who was at fault. Considering compelling car vs bike collision statistics (enormous increases in recent years) provided by the Motor Accident Commission, RAA and Amy Gillett Foundation the Jury felt a **sense of urgency** to ensure people were able to ride safely as soon as possible.
2. The Jury observed quickly that there was a disjointed infrastructure in SA for bikes. They also considered that large scale improvements in infrastructure were going to take time and money.
3. This issue also gained traction as a way to promote more families cycling together safely

Cycling on footpaths was the quickest, simplest solution to save lives immediately and was quickly accepted by the Jury as a ‘quick win’ across all fronts.

## **Why the Jury thought this was a good idea?**

* Saves lives immediately by preventing cars and bikes from sharing roads
* Great option while we allow time for driver behaviour to change
* Ensures people have a safe place to ride when they don’t feel safe – and can do so without being fined
* Gets bikes off the road without huge investment in cycling infrastructure
* Gets more people cycling with their families – important for health & wellbeing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Problems/issues the Jury discussed** | **Ideas/Ways to combat** |
| Could pedestrians be at risk from inconsiderate cyclists (purposeful, aggression)? | Rider educationFines for dangerous riding |
| Could pedestrians be at risk from well-meaning cyclists (accidental collision)? | Rider educationSignage Separated pathways |
| Will cyclists understand that the onus is on them to ensure pedestrians are safe? | Rider education & messaging  |
| Could the speed of cyclists could put pedestrians in danger? | Speed limits deemed most effective – Jury discovered that this needs to be determined by Local Council.  |

## **Were any qualifiers recommended in relation to allowing cycling on footpaths?**

 “As part of this recommendation it must be clear to cyclists, that they travel at low speeds and have enhanced consideration of pedestrians.” Footpath recommendation: Jury final report

## **Were the views of pedestrians considered in the deliberations? What evidence or testimony was considered by the jury in relation to this?**

Key insights information presented came from:

* Accident Statistics from MAC, RAA and Amy Gillett (Compelling statistics on numbers of cars vs bike accidents, enforcing that the safest option was having bikes off the road where they had less chance of death or serious injury)
* Bike SA (less than 10% of riders are classified as sport cyclists, so therefore the Jury came to the conclusion that a small number of people would able to or likely to ride fast on footpaths)
* Research from Adelaide Uni (psychology of new riders who respond to the invitation to cycle more – they need a safe option as their confidence and skills build)
* SA Government Cycling Strategy (recognition that the ideal cycling infrastructure might take time to eventuate, so cycling on footpaths was seen as a sensible, immediate safety option).
* Streets for People compendium (benefits of people co-existing on shared paths)

*“Of course, the safety of pedestrians have to be considered too. For example, bicycles cannot travel too fast. Mixing speeds is dangerous in any situations.”* Juror Quote

**NB: There was no specific evidence considered regarding cycling on footpaths and people with disabilities.**

# **Quotes from Jurors regarding Cycling on Footpaths**

“Allowing riding on footpath gives cyclists a safer choice to separate them from vehicles. When there is no cycle lane and someone does not feel confident and safe to ride among vehicles, riding on footpath could give them a peace mind.”

“Adults riding with kids on footpaths is a good idea. Other cyclists on footpaths is not a good idea. Cyclists and pedestrians don't mix well.”

“Many busy roads that have no bikes lanes have footpaths that are sparsely used by pedestrians.  In this context, allowing bikes [that means adult cyclists too] to use the footpath is a practical and common sense safety move.”

“I totally support this. I think I mentioned to a few people over the past couple of weeks that on the ANU campus in Canberra where I lived and studied there were shared pathways for pedestrians and cyclists and it worked really well”.