

Changes to The Highway Code: improving safety for cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders

Introduction

Thank you for responding to our consultation on The Highway Code. Your views will assist in helping us to update The Highway Code to improve safety for cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders.

We suggest you read the full consultation document which contains the background information and proposals in full.

The closing date for this interim review of The Highway Code consultation is 11:59pm on 27 October 2020.

Print or save a copy of your response

When you get to the end of this questionnaire, you will be offered the chance to either print or save a copy of your response for your records. This option appears after you press 'Submit your response'.

Save and continue option

You have an option to 'save and continue' your response at any time. If you do that you will be sent a link via email to allow you to continue your response where you left off.

It's very important that you enter your correct email address if you choose to save and continue. If you make a mistake in the email address you won't receive the link you need to complete your response.

Confidentiality and data protection

The Department for Transport (DfT) is running this consultation on The Highway Code as part of its [Cycling and walking safety review](#). Your views will assist in helping us to update The Highway Code to improve safety for cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders. The consultation will run until midnight on 27 October 2020.

Your consultation response and the processing of personal data that it entails is necessary for the exercise of our functions as a government department. Any information you provide that allows individual people to be identified, including yourself, will be protected by data protection law and DfT will be the controller for this information.

[DfT's privacy policy](#) has more information about your rights in relation to your personal data, how to complain and how to contact the Data Protection Officer.

In this consultation we're asking for:

- your name and email address, in case we need to ask you follow-up questions about your responses (you do not have to give us this personal information, but if you do provide it, we will use it only for the purpose of asking follow-up questions)
- whether you are representing an organisation and, if so, the name of that organisation

Additionally as an individual we are asking for your main method of travel in order to better understand how your:

- opinions may be influenced towards
- situation may be affected by

the changes to The Highway Code.

Your information will be kept securely and destroyed within 12 months after the closing date. Any information provided through the online questionnaire will be moved to our internal systems within 2 months of the funding period end date.

Your details

Your (used for contact details only):

name?

email?

Are you responding: *



as an individual? (Go to main method of travel section)



on behalf of an organisation?

Organisation details

What is the name of your organisation?

(Go to The Highway Code review)

Main method of travel

Do you identify mainly as a:



vehicle driver?



motorcyclist?



cyclist?



pedestrian?



mobility scooter user?



horse rider?



other?

The Highway Code review

This interim review of The Highway Code focusses on:

- cyclists
- pedestrians
- horse riders

It is specifically considering:

- overtaking
- passing distances
- cyclist and pedestrian priority at junctions
- opening vehicle doors
- responsibility of road users

There are 3 main changes that are being proposed through this consultation:

1. introduction of a hierarchy of road users which ensures that those road users who can do the greatest harm have the greatest responsibility to reduce the danger or threat they may pose to others
2. clarifying existing rules on pedestrian priority on pavements and that drivers and riders should give way to pedestrians crossing or waiting to cross the road
3. establishing guidance on safe passing distances and speeds when overtaking cyclists or horse riders, and ensuring they have priority at junctions when travelling straight ahead

Hierarchy of road users

Rule H1 of The Highway Code establishes a hierarchy of road users which ensures that those road users who can do the greatest harm have the greatest responsibility to reduce the danger or threat they may pose to other road users.

The hierarchy places vulnerable road users before motorised vehicles so the top of the hierarchy would therefore be:

1. pedestrians, in particular children, older adults and disabled people
2. cyclists
3. horse riders
4. motorcyclists

The objective of Rule H1 is not to give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders in every situation, but rather to ensure a more mutually respectful and considerate culture of safe and effective road use that benefits all users. This does not detract from the requirement for everyone to behave responsibly.

The proposed new text is:

"It is important that ALL road users are aware of The Highway Code, are considerate to other road users and understand their responsibility for the safety of others.

Everyone suffers when road collisions occur, whether they are physically injured or not. But those in charge of vehicles that can cause the greatest harm in the event of a collision bear the greatest responsibility to take care and reduce the danger they pose to others. This principle applies most strongly to drivers of large goods and passenger vehicles, followed by vans/minibuses, cars/taxis and motorcycles.

Cyclists, horse riders and horse drawn vehicles likewise have a responsibility to reduce danger to pedestrians.

Always remember that the people you encounter may have impaired sight, hearing or mobility, and may not be able to see or hear you.

None of this detracts from the responsibility of all road users, including pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders, to have regard for their own and other road users' safety."

Do you agree with the introduction of new Rule H1?



Yes (Go to Hierarchy of users wording)



No



Don't know? (Go to Hierarchy of users wording)

Disagree with hierarchy of users

Why not?

Hierarchy of users wording

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to clarification of right of way and stronger priorities for pedestrians)



No



Don't know? (Go to clarification of right of way and stronger priorities for pedestrians)

Disagree with hierarchy of users wording

Why not?

The Bikeability Trust welcomes the introduction of new Rule H1, the hierarchy of road users'. A mutually considerate and responsible culture is essential for our roads.

93% of Bikeability Professionals agree with the introduction of Rule H1, however there are some consistent themes that need addressing to enhance the effectiveness this rule:

- The need for a strong publicity / educational campaign to raise awareness of these and other proposed changes in the review. This will be a repeated theme in our feedback.
- We believe that horses are misplaced in the hierarchy. We suggest they are combined with cyclists in the hierarchy, as measuring or quantifying 'vulnerability' is difficult, and to set an order for these two road users is open to discussion. We suggest the following change:

"The hierarchy places vulnerable road users before motorised vehicles so the top of the hierarchy would therefore be:

1. pedestrians, in particular children, older adults and disabled people
2. cyclists & horse riders
3. motorcyclists"

- Consideration should be given to how this hierarchy is implemented in legal cases with regard to liability.

Clarification of right of way and stronger priorities for pedestrians

Rule H2 clarifies where pedestrians have right of way and creates clearer and stronger priorities for pedestrians, particularly at junctions. It seeks to emphasise where road users:

- SHOULD give way to pedestrians crossing a road
- MUST give way to pedestrians on a zebra crossing, and pedestrians and cyclists on a parallel crossing

It introduces a new obligation for drivers and riders to give way to pedestrians waiting to cross a junction (side road), or zebra crossing.

The proposed new text is:

"Rule for drivers, motorcyclists, horse riders and cyclists

At a junction you should give way to pedestrians crossing or waiting to cross a road into which or from which you are turning.

You MUST give way to pedestrians on a zebra crossing, and pedestrians and cyclists on a parallel crossing.

You should give way to pedestrians waiting to cross a zebra crossing, and pedestrians and cyclists waiting to cross on a parallel crossing

Horse riders and horse drawn vehicles should also give way to pedestrians on a zebra crossing, and pedestrians and cyclists on a parallel crossing.

Pedestrians have priority when on a zebra crossing, on a parallel crossing or at light controlled crossings when they have a green signal.

Cyclists should give way to pedestrians on shared use cycle tracks.

Only pedestrians may use the pavement. This includes people using wheelchairs and mobility scooters.

Pedestrians may use any part of the road and use cycle tracks as well as the pavement, unless there are signs prohibiting pedestrians."

Do you agree with the introduction of new Rule H2?



Yes (Go to stronger priorities for pedestrians wording)

No

Don't know? (Go to stronger priorities for pedestrians wording)

Disagree with stronger priorities for pedestrians

Why not?

We welcome almost all of new **Rule H2** as a very practical clarification of priorities for pedestrians and to express the hierarchy of road users.

We believe that the following statement in new **Rule H2** needs further consideration:

“At a junction you should give way to pedestrians crossing or waiting to cross a road into which or from which you are turning.”

In the current Highway Code, Rule 170 states that if a pedestrian has 'started to cross' a road, they have priority. This is currently largely unknown or ignored by road users and pedestrians alike. On the whole, people do not currently behave according to this rule.

We strongly maintain that any strengthening of this rule must be accompanied by an extremely robust publicity campaign in order to have any affect at all, otherwise the potential is that this small part of Rule H2 will increase conflict and incidents.

Without enforcement and public understanding, this rule will be severely weakened as to be ineffective.

We are additionally concerned that a vulnerable road user, such as a cyclist turning left, who may have stopped on a major road to allow a pedestrian to cross at the top of a junction, is potentially exposed to being struck from behind by another road user who have not carried out appropriate observations. This problem would be increased on roads with higher speed and traffic volume.

We feel that to accompany the implementation of Rule 1 and 2, and to reduce incidents at junctions, speed restrictions of 20mph in all built up areas should be considered. Slower moving road users have more time to observe their surrounding and react to other road users. However, we realise that this is outside of the scope of The Highway Code consultation.

Stronger priorities for pedestrians wording

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to cyclists priorities and right of way)

No

Don't know? (Go to cyclists priorities and right of way)

Disagrees with stronger priorities for pedestrians wording

Why not?

See above

Cyclists priorities and right of way

Rule H3 clarifies cyclists' priorities. It makes clear that a driver should not cut across the path of a cyclist going straight ahead when they are:

- turning into or out of a junction
- changing direction
- changing lane

This applies whether cyclists are using a cycle lane, a cycle track, or riding ahead on the road.

It also recommends that drivers and motorcyclists should not turn at a junction if to do so would cause the cyclist going straight ahead to stop or swerve.

The proposed new text is:

"Rule for drivers and motorcyclists

You should not cut across cyclists going ahead when turning into or out of a junction or changing direction or lane, just as you would not turn across the path of another motor vehicle. This applies whether cyclists are using a cycle lane, a cycle track, or riding ahead on the road and you should give way to them.

Do not turn at a junction if to do so would cause the cyclist going straight ahead to stop or swerve, just as you would do with a motor vehicle.

You should stop and wait for a safe gap in the flow of cyclists if necessary. This includes when cyclists are:

- approaching, passing or moving off from a junction
- moving past or waiting alongside stationary or slow-moving traffic
- travelling around a roundabout"

Do you agree with the introduction of new Rule H3?



Yes (Go to cyclists priorities and right of way wording)



No



Don't know? (Go to cyclists priorities and right of way wording)

Disagree with cyclists priorities and right of way

Why not?

Cyclists priorities and right of way wording

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to rules for pedestrians)



No



Don't know? (Go to rules for pedestrians)

Cyclists priorities and right of way

Why not?

We welcome the introduction of new Rule H3, however we feel further strengthening is needed to encourage adherence to the rule, to give strength to the hierarchy of users, and to make it more enforceable. We believe that it should be strengthened to:

“You must not cut across cyclists going ahead when turning into or out of a junction or changing direction or lane, just as you would not turn across the path of another motor vehicle. This applies whether cyclists are using a cycle lane, a cycle track, or riding ahead on the road and you should give way to them.

Do not turn at a junction if to do so would cause the cyclist going straight ahead to stop or swerve, just as you would do with a motor vehicle.

You must stop and wait for a safe gap in the flow of cyclists if necessary. This includes when cyclists are:

- approaching, passing or moving off from a junction
- moving past or waiting alongside stationary or slow-moving traffic
- travelling around a roundabout"

We think this is important to give cyclists the same status as other road users, and for these rules to be enforceable legally, which will lead to greater adherence.”

Rules for pedestrians

The Highway Code already advises drivers and riders to give priority to pedestrians who have started to cross the road. The proposed change is to introduce a responsibility for drivers and riders to give way to pedestrians waiting to cross:

- a junction or side road
- at a zebra crossing


For Rule 8 on junctions the proposed new text is:

"When you are crossing or waiting to cross the road other traffic should give way."

For Rule 19 on zebra crossings the proposed new text is:

"Drivers and riders should give way to pedestrians waiting to cross and **MUST** give way to pedestrians on a zebra crossing."

Do you agree with the proposed change to give way to pedestrians waiting at a:

	Yes	No	Don't know?
junction?			
zebra crossing?			

If no, why not?

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to rules for pedestrians further comments)



No



Don't know? (Go to rules for pedestrians further comments)

Disagrees with rules for pedestrians wording

Why not?

In the current Highway Code, Rule 170 states that if a pedestrian has 'started to cross' a road, they have priority. This is currently largely unknown or ignored by road users and pedestrians alike. On the whole, people do not currently behave according to this rule.

We strongly maintain that any strengthening of this rule must be accompanied by an extremely robust publicity campaign in order to have any affect at all, otherwise the potential is that this small part of Rule H2 will increase conflict and incidents.

Without enforcement and public understanding, this rule will be severely weakened as to be ineffective.

We are additionally concerned that a vulnerable road user, such as a cyclist turning left, who may have stopped on a major road to allow a pedestrian to cross at the top of a junction, is potentially exposed to being struck from behind by another road user who have not carried out appropriate observations. This problem would be increased on roads with higher speed and traffic volume.

We feel that to accompany the implementation of Rule 1 and 2, and to reduce incidents at junctions, speed restrictions of 20mph in all built up areas should be considered. Slower moving road users have more time to observe their surrounding and react to other road users. However, we realise that this is outside of the scope of The Highway Code consultation.

Rules for pedestrians

Do you have any further comments about other changes to the rules for pedestrians?

Rules about animals

To ensure inexperienced or returning horse riders consider training before riding on roads we are proposing amending Rule 52 to include a suggestion that they take the [British Horse Society Ride Safe Award](#). The proposed new text is:

"If you are an inexperienced horse rider or have not ridden for a while, consider taking the Ride Safe Award from the British Horse Society. The Ride Safe Award provides a foundation for any horse rider to be safe and knowledgeable when riding in all environments but particularly on the road."

Do you agree to the proposed change to Rule 52?



Yes (Go to rules for animals wording)



No



Don't know? (Go to rules for animals wording)

Disagrees with rules for animals

Why not?

Rules for animals wording

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to rules for cyclists)



No



Don't know? (Go to rules for cyclists)

Disagrees with rules for animals wording

Why not?

Rules for cyclists

The main proposed changes to the rules for cyclists section of The Highway Code are to:

- clarify priorities
- provide guidance to encourage safe cycling

Rule 63 will be amended to provide guidance for cyclists on sharing space. The additional proposed text is:

"Sharing space with pedestrians, horse riders and horse drawn vehicles. When riding in places where sharing with pedestrians, horse riders or horse drawn vehicles is permitted take care when passing pedestrians, especially children, older adults or disabled people. Let them know you are there when necessary e.g. by ringing your bell (it is recommended that a bell is fitted to your bike), or by calling out politely.

Remember that pedestrians may be deaf, blind or partially sighted and that this may not be obvious.

Do not pass pedestrians, horse riders or horse drawn vehicles closely or at high speed,

particularly from behind. Remember that horses can be startled if passed without warning. Always be prepared to slow down and stop when necessary."

Do you agree with the proposed change to rule 63?



Yes (Go to rule 63 for cyclists wording: shared spaces)



No



Don't know? (Go to rule 63 for cyclists wording: shared spaces)

Disagrees with Rule 63 for cyclists: shared spaces

Why not?

Rule 63 for cyclists wording: shared spaces

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to Rule 72 for cyclists)



No



Don't know? (Go to Rule 72 for cyclists)

Disagrees with Rule 63 for cyclists wording: shared spaces

Why not?

We welcome the amends to Rule 63, along with 98% of Bikeability professionals who agree with the changes to Rule 63

However we have concerns over using a bell when approaching horses, as this can alarm the horse. We recommend adding the following sentence:

"Sharing space with pedestrians, horse riders and horse drawn vehicles. When riding in places where sharing with pedestrians, horse riders or horse drawn vehicles is permitted take care when passing pedestrians, especially children, older adults or disabled people. Let them know

you are there when necessary e.g. by ringing your bell (it is recommended that a bell is fitted to your bike), or by calling out politely.

When approaching horse riders or horse drawn vehicles, calling out politely is recommended instead of ringing your bell, to avoid alarming the horse"

Rules for cyclists

Rule 72 will be amended to provide guidance on road positioning for cyclists to ensure that they adopt safe cycling behaviours. The additional proposed text is:













"Road positioning. When riding on the roads, there are two basic road positions you should adopt, depending on the situation.

1. Ride in the centre of your lane, to make yourself as clearly visible as possible, in the following situations:

- on quiet roads or streets – if a faster vehicle comes up behind you, move to the left to enable them to overtake, if you can do so safely
- in slower-moving traffic move over to the left, if you can do so safely, so that faster vehicles behind you can overtake when the traffic around you starts to flow more freely
- at the approach to junctions or road narrowings where it would be unsafe for drivers to overtake you

2. When riding on busy roads, with vehicles moving faster than you, allow them to overtake where it is safe to do so whilst keeping at least 0.5m (metres) away from the kerb edge. Remember that traffic on most dual carriageways moves quickly. Take extra care crossing slip roads."

Do you agree with the proposed change to Rule 72 to ride:

	Yes	No	Don't know?
in the centre of your lane on quiet roads?			
in the centre of your lane in slower moving traffic?			
in the centre of your lane when approaching junctions?			
at least 0.5 metres away from the kerb on busy roads?			

If no, why not?

The National Standard for Cycle Training and the Bikeability Deliver Guide use the two road positions as defined by John Franklin in CycleCraft. We suggest they are especially helpful and well worth considering:

The primary and secondary riding positions taught in Bikeability have been defined by John Franklin in Cyclecraft as follows:

'The primary position is in the centre of the leftmost moving traffic lane for the direction in which you wish to travel....

The secondary position ... is about 1 metre (3 feet) to the left of the moving traffic lane if the road is wide, but not closer than 0.5 metre (1.5 feet) to the edge of any road.... The secondary riding position is always relative to the line of moving traffic, not the road edge.'

We believe that the text in Rule 72 should read:

"When riding on the roads, there are two basic road positions you should adopt, depending on the situation.

1. Ride in the centre of your lane, to make yourself as clearly visible as possible, in the following situations:
 - at the approach to junctions and when passing through them, or road narrowings where it would be unsafe for drivers to overtake you
 - when passing side roads
 - in slower-moving traffic when you can keep pace with the traffic flow.
2. When riding with vehicles moving faster than you, ride 1 metre to the left of the moving traffic lane if the road is wide, but not closer than 0.5 metre (1.5 feet) to the edge of any road. Remember that traffic on most dual carriageways moves quickly. Take extra care crossing slip roads."

Road position for a cyclist should not be dictated by volume of traffic, but rather by its speed, the space available, and the need for a cyclist to ride assertively and visibly through or past a junction.

This question was of great concern to most Bikeability programme professionals, which we have reflected in the wording above. In addition:

- There were clear calls for greater clarity in the wording, consistency with what is being taught through Bikeability and the National Standards for Cycle Training and specifically the distance riders should aim to position themselves in relation to the traffic flow or kerb.
- On the issue of clarity, many felt that the wording should be altered to rebalance the responsibility onto the vehicle behind - *"I think the wording of the rules need more refining: especially anything that implies that it's the cyclist's responsibility to decide whether it's safe for a driver to overtake. It isn't possible for a cyclist to judge what the driver behind can or can't do safely, or what speed the vehicle is traveling at"* and *"It should be stressed that a cyclist should encourage drivers to pass only if safe to do so. Therefore, the wording should be flipped to read 'where it is safe to do so allow drivers to pass'"*.
- 38 respondents argued strongly that the guidance on the distance should be changed to 1.0 metre from the traffic flow.

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to Rule 73 for cyclists)



No



Don't know? (Go to Rule 73 for cyclists)

Disagrees with Rule 72 for cyclists: road positioning

Why not?

See previous comments box

Rules for cyclists

Rule 73 will be amended to provide guidance for cyclists on how to proceed safely at junctions, both with and without separate cyclist facilities. The additional proposed text is:

"Junctions. Some junctions, particularly those with traffic lights, have special cycle facilities, including small cycle traffic lights at eye-level height, which may allow you to move or cross separately from or ahead of other traffic. Use these facilities where they make your journey safer and easier.

At junctions with no separate cyclist facilities, it is recommended that you proceed as if you were driving a motor vehicle (see Rules 170 to 190). Position yourself in the centre of your chosen lane, where you feel able to do this safely, to make yourself as visible as possible and to avoid being overtaken where this would be dangerous. If you do not feel safe to proceed in this way, you may prefer to dismount and wheel your bike across the junction."

Do you agree with the proposed change to Rule 73 at junctions with:

	Yes	No	Don't know?
special cyclist facilities?			
no separate cyclist facilities?			

If no, why not?

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to Rule 76 for cyclists)



No



Don't know? (Go to Rule 76 for cyclists)

Disagrees with Rule 73 for cyclists wording: junctions

Why not?

93% of Bikeability professionals agreed with the proposed change to rule 73.

There was general agreement with the spirit of the change but some disquiet reflected in comments surrounding the this advice:

"If you do not feel safe to proceed in this way, you may prefer to dismount and wheel your bike across the junction."

If the Highway Code is advising people to dismount and walking their cycle, the ambition to introduce the hierarchy of road users has failed, and the fearful response noted above does nothing to legitimise cycles on the roads.

We suggest that the quote above is removed.

Rules for cyclists

Rule 76 will be amended to clarify priorities when going straight ahead. The additional proposed text is:

"Going straight ahead. If you are going straight ahead at a junction, you have priority over traffic waiting to turn into or out of the side road, unless road signs or markings indicate otherwise (see Rule H3). Check that you can proceed safely, particularly when approaching junctions on the left alongside stationary or slow-moving traffic.

Watch out for drivers intending to turn across your path. Remember the driver ahead may not be able to see you, so bear in mind your speed and position in the road.

Be particularly careful alongside lorries and other long vehicles, as their drivers may find it difficult to see you. Remember that they may have to move over to the right before turning left, and that their rear wheels may then come very close to the kerb while turning."

Do you agree with the proposed change to Rule 76?



Yes (Go to rule 76 for cyclists wording: going straight ahead)



No



Don't know? (Go to rule 76 for cyclists wording: going straight ahead)

Disagrees with Rule 76 for cyclists: going straight ahead

Why not?

Rule 76 for cyclists wording: going straight ahead

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to rules for cyclists further comments)



No



Don't know? (Go to rules for cyclists further comments)

Disagrees with Rule 76 for cyclists wording: going straight ahead

Why not?

We have concerns over the clarity of the wording. When passing a side road, a cyclist should ride in the centre of their lane to see and be seen, and to prevent hazardous over or undertaking. In stationary or slow-moving traffic, a cyclist may choose to filter, but not undertake vehicles which are about to turn left.

We suggest the following changes to rule 76

"Going straight ahead. If you are going straight ahead on a major road and passing a junction, you have priority over traffic waiting to turn into or out of the side road, unless road signs or markings indicate otherwise (see Rule H3). When passing a side road, cyclists should ride in the centre of their lane to increase visibility and prevent hazardous overtaking.

When approaching junctions in stationary or slow-moving traffic see Rule 163 for advice on passing slow-moving or stationary traffic.

As new Rule H3 makes clear, drivers must not turn left across the path of a cyclist, however cyclists must still be particularly careful around lorries and other long vehicles, as their drivers may find it difficult to see you. Remember that they may have to move over to the right before turning left, and that their rear wheels may then come very close to the kerb while turning. Do not undertake a vehicle when it is turning left.

Cyclists should always be aware of driver blind spots, another road user may not be able to see you, so make good and frequent observations, and make eye contact with other road users.”

Rules for cyclists

There are several other changes within the rules for cyclists section (and we recommend reading the chapter before answering). Some of these changes are to update The Highway Code to recognise new cyclist facilities that are already in use on the highway. Other proposed amendments are to provide guidance on safe riding behaviour and practices. In summary, some of the changes include, but are not limited to:

- clarification on cycle tracks and their use
- riding in groups on narrow lanes
- advice on riding safely on the road and when turning
- clarification on cyclist facilities at crossings and their use

Do you have any further comments about other changes to the rules for cyclists?

Cycle Lanes and Tracks

We suggest alterations to the proposed description of cycle lanes. In our experience, most road users assume that cycles belong only on cycle infrastructure. Swapping the order of some of the words in The Highway Code would draw closer attention to the fact that cyclists can choose whether or not to use infrastructure.

The proposed description of cycle lanes should read:

“Cyclists are not obliged to use cycle lanes, and may exercise their judgement when doing so. Cycle lanes are marked by a white line (which may be broken) along the carriageway (see Rule 140). Use facilities such as cycle lanes and tracks, advanced stop lines and toucan crossings (see Rules 62, 63 and 73) where they make your journey safer and easier. This will depend on your experience, skill and the situation at the time.”

The description of cycle tracks should read:

“Cyclists are not obliged to use cycle tracks, and may exercise their judgement when doing so. These are routes for cyclists that are physically protected or located away from motor traffic, other than where they cross side roads (see Rule 206). Cycle tracks may run alongside

footpaths or pavements and be separated by a feature such as a change of material, a verge, a kerb or a white line.”

Rule 59

A proposed update to Rule 59 will state “that evidence suggests that wearing a cycle helmet will reduce your risk of sustaining a head injury in certain circumstances.”

We suggest that any rule around helmets must make clear that wearing a helmet is a personal choice. If someone chooses to wear a helmet, it must conform to current regulations, and must be fitted properly.

Rule 66

The proposed addition to Rule 66 reads:

“[cyclists should] ride in single file when drivers wish to overtake, and it is safe to let them do so. When riding in larger groups on narrow lanes, it is sometimes safer to ride two abreast”

We believe that this should not be included for the following reasons:

1. It undermines the hierarchy of road users.
2. It is ambiguous and open to interpretation.
3. The decision to overtake should rest with the person overtaking, not with the person being overtaken.
4. A line of cyclists doubled up is shorter than a line in single file. Any overtaking should be done when there is no oncoming traffic, so the width of the vehicle being overtaken is immaterial.
5. People ride doubled up for several different reasons, including riding as a family, with a parent acting as a shield and confidence booster for a child. It is also a helpful to move groups of new or less confident cyclists.
6. During Bikeability training, groups of 12 riders are often moved from one site to another riding two abreast. This method helps the group to travel as a unit, gives confidence to less confident riders and is much shorter. Pressure to single out can encourage hazardous overtaking and can split the group.
7. We agree with wording suggested by British Cycling:
“You should be considerate of the needs of other road users when riding in small or large groups. You can ride two abreast and it is often safer to do so, particularly in larger groups or when accompanying children or less experienced riders. Be aware of drivers behind you, allowing them to overtake (e.g. by moving into single file) when you feel it is safe to let them do so.”

Rule 67

Proposed new wording to this rule says: “take care when passing parked vehicles, leaving enough room (a door’s width or 0.5m)”

We suggest that the reference to 0.5m is removed. A car door is often significantly longer than this, and riders should be encouraged to remain more than a doors width away from any parked car.

Rule 74

Advice on turning will be merged in Rule 72 and 74:

"It maybe safer to wait on the left until there is a safe gap or to dismount and push your cycle across the road."

Every vehicle turning right must wait for oncoming traffic to clear. On the strength of the hierarchy of road users, cyclists should be given the confidence not to get off and walk their cycle. This part of the proposed wording does not promote a cyclist as an equal road user or support the hierarchy of road users. When turning right, a cyclist should wait in the centre of their lane.

Rule 79

Additional text to rule 79 will read:

"If you are turning right you can ride in the left or right-hand lanes and move left when approaching your exit. Position yourself in the centre of your lane if it is safe to do so (see Rule 72) and signal right to indicate that you are not leaving the roundabout."

To avoid confusion, we believe that cycles should use the same lanes as other road users when negotiating junctions and roundabouts. Also, some riders may be less confident to signal on a roundabout when control is needed most. We suggest the additional text should read:

"If you are turning right you should ride in right-hand lane and move left when approaching your exit. Make good and frequent observations, position yourself in the centre of your lane when it is safe to do so (see Rule 72)"

Rule 154

We support British Cycling in their suggested addition to Rule 154, regarding riding two abreast:

"When meeting groups of cyclists riding two abreast, they may choose to move to single file if they deem it safer to do so. They are under no compulsion to do so and it can be safer and easier for you to overtake a compact group, when conditions allow, rather than a longer line of cycles."

Rules for drivers and motorcyclists

Rule 97 has been amended to include additional text which states that before setting off you should ensure that:

"any fitted audible warning systems for other road users, and camera and audio alert systems for drivers are all working and active (and should be used appropriately on the road)."

Do you have any comments about the proposed change to Rule 97?

No

General rules, techniques and advice for all drivers and riders

The proposed changes to the general rules, techniques and advice for all drivers and riders section of The Highway Code include ensuring that 20mph speed limits and other local speed limits, which already exist, are recognised in The Highway Code.

For Rule 123 on the driver and the environment, the proposed new text is:





"In some local authority regions or in built up areas the limit may be reduced to 20 mph."

For Rule 124 on maximum speed limits, the proposed new text is:

"Local signed speed limits may apply, for example:

- 20 mph (rather than 30 mph) where it could be the limit across a region or in certain built-up areas such as close to schools
- 50 mph (rather than 60 mph) on stretches of road with sharp bends"

Is the proposed wording in Rule:

	Yes	No	Don't know?
123 easy to understand?			
124 easy to understand?			

If no, why not?

General rules, techniques and advice for all drivers and riders

Rule 140 will be amended to provide advice on cycle lanes and cycle tracks, ensuring that drivers and riders know that cyclists have priority and should give way when turning across their path. The additional proposed text is:







"You should give way to any cyclists in a cycle lane, including when they are approaching from behind you – do not cut across them when turning or when changing lane (see Rule H3). Be prepared to stop and wait for a safe gap in the flow of cyclists before crossing the cycle lane.

Cycle tracks are routes for cyclists that are physically protected or located away from motor traffic, other than where they cross side roads. Cycle tracks may be shared with pedestrians.

You should give way to cyclists approaching or using the cycle track when turning into or out of a junction (see Rule H3). Be prepared to stop and wait for a safe gap in the flow of cyclists before crossing the cycle track, which may be used by cyclists travelling in both directions.

Bear in mind that cyclists are not obliged to use cycle lanes or cycle tracks."

Do you agree with the proposed changes to Rule 140 on giving way to cyclists using a cycle:

	Yes	No	Don't know?
lane?			
track?			

If no, why not?

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to general rules, techniques and advice for all drivers and riders further comments)



No



Don't know? (Go to general rules, techniques and advice for all drivers and riders further comments)

Disagrees with Rule 140 on general rules, techniques and advice for all drivers and riders wording: cycle lanes and cycle tracks

Why not?

We welcome proposed changes to advice on cycle lanes and tracks, however we propose that they be strengthened further from 'should' to 'must'.

Our proposed changes are:

"You must give way to any cyclists in a cycle lane, including when they are approaching from behind you – do not cut across them when turning or when changing lane (see Rule H3). Be prepared to stop and wait for a safe gap in the flow of cyclists before crossing the cycle lane.

Cycle tracks are routes for cyclists that are physically protected or located away from motor traffic, other than where they cross side roads. Cycle tracks may be shared with pedestrians.

You must give way to cyclists approaching or using the cycle track when turning into or out of a junction (see Rule H3). Be prepared to stop and wait for a safe gap in the flow of cyclists before crossing the cycle track, which may be used by cyclists travelling in both directions."

This then recognises people on cycles as legitimate road users and is in keeping with the hierarchy of road users, it also makes the rule more enforceable.

Programme professionals were in agreement with the proposals, 95% for lane and 91% for track.

Important considerations raised included the following:

- The need for clear need for road markings where cycle tracks cross junctions/minor roads to indicate drivers must give way.
- The need for robust enforcement of these rules
- The need for a robust national campaign to highlight changes to the highway code.

General rules, techniques and advice for all drivers and riders

There are several other changes within the general rules techniques and advice for all drivers section (and we recommend reading the chapter before answering). Some of these changes are to update The Highway Code to recognise processes and practices that are already in use on the highway. In summary, some of the changes include, but are not limited to:

- providing further clarity on when drivers of motorised vehicles should give way to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders
- making clear that those groups have priority over traffic that may be turning across their path in certain situations
- reinforcing advice around inappropriate speed

Do you have any further comments about the changes to the general rules, techniques and advice for all drivers and riders?

Only to firmly reiterate the need to widely publicise any changes to the Highway Code, to lead to behaviour change on the roads.

Using the road

The 'Using the road' chapter in The Highway Code provides guidance and advice on overtaking, manoeuvring at road junctions and roundabouts, and procedures at different types of crossings.

Rule 163 on overtaking will be amended to advise drivers that cyclists may pass on their right or

left. It will also provide a guide of safe passing distances and speeds for passing motorcyclists, cyclists, horse riders and horse drawn vehicles. The additional proposed text is:

"Cyclists may pass slower moving or stationary traffic on their right or left, including at the approach to junctions, but are advised to exercise caution when doing so

[Give motorcyclists, cyclists, horse riders] and horse drawn vehicles [at least as much room as you would when overtaking a car(see Rules 211 to 215)]. As a guide:

- leave a minimum distance of 1.5 metres at speeds under 30 mph
- leave a minimum distance of 2.0 metres at speeds over 30 mph
- for a large vehicle, leave a minimum distance of 2.0 metres in all conditions
- pass horse riders and horse-drawn vehicles at speeds under 15 mph and allow at least 2.0 metres space
- allow at least 2.0 metres space where a pedestrian is walking in the road (e.g. where there is no pavement) and you should pass them at low speed
- you should wait behind the motorcyclist, cyclist, horse rider, horse drawn vehicle or pedestrian and not overtake if it is unsafe or not possible to meet these clearances
- take extra care and give more space when overtaking motorcyclists, cyclists, horse riders, horse drawn vehicles and pedestrians in bad weather (including high winds) and at night."

Do you agree that cyclists may pass slower moving traffic on their right or left as detailed in Rule 163?



Yes (Go to using the road rule 163 overtaking speeds)



No



Don't know? (Go to using the road rule 163 overtaking speeds)

Disagree with using the road: passing on the right or left

Why not?

We suggest that this sentence:

"Cyclists may pass slower moving or stationary traffic on their right or left, including at the approach to junctions, but are advised to exercise caution when doing so"

Is replaced with:

"Cyclists may pass slower moving or stationary traffic on their right or left, including at the approach to junctions, but are advised to exercise caution when doing so, scanning for potential hazards including doors opening and other road users. Cyclists may also choose to remain in the centre of their lane, in the flow of traffic."

We believe it is important for riders to understand what hazards to be aware of when filtering, and that they also have an opportunity not to.

Opinion of programme professionals varied on the merits of using either side to pass slow mobbing or stationary traffic.

Using the road

Do you agree with the proposed speed limits detailed at Rule 163 for overtaking:













	Yes	No	Don't know?
motorcyclists?			
cyclists?			
horse riders?			
horse drawn vehicles?			

If no, why not?

Amendments to Rule 163 proposes different minimum passing distance at different speeds for different vulnerable road users.

We believe that this should be simplified to a minimum passing distance of 2 metres at all times for all road users and traffic speeds. This will be much easier to understand, disseminate, and enforce.

Do you agree with the proposed passing distances detailed at Rule 163 for overtaking:


	Yes	No	Don't know?
motorcyclists?			
cyclists?			
horse riders?			
horse drawn vehicles?			


If no, why not?


Amendments to Rule 163 proposes different minimum passing distance at different speeds for different vulnerable road users.

We believe that this should be simplified to a minimum passing distance of 2 metres at all times for all road users and traffic speeds. This will be much easier to understand, disseminate, and enforce.

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?

 Yes (Go to using the road rule 186)

 **No**

 Don't know? (Go to using the road rule 186)

Disagrees with Rule 163 for using the road wording: overtaking

Why not?

Amendments to Rule 163 proposes different minimum passing distance at different speeds for different vulnerable road users. We believe that this should be simplified to a minimum passing distance of 2 metres at all times for all road users and traffic speeds.

We welcome these two statements from Rule 163

- “you should wait behind the motorist, cyclist, horse rider, horse drawn vehicle or pedestrian and do not overtake if it is unsafe or not possible to meet these clearances.
- take extra care and give more space when overtaking motorcyclists, cyclists, horse riders, horse drawn vehicles and pedestrians in bad weather (including high winds) and at night”
















Using the road

Rule 186 on signals and position will be amended to advise drivers to give priority to cyclists on roundabouts, and to take care not to cut across a cyclist, horse rider or horse drawn vehicle that may be continuing around the roundabout in the left-hand lane. The additional proposed text is:

"You should give priority to cyclists on the roundabout. They will be travelling more slowly than motorised traffic. Give them plenty of room and do not attempt to overtake them within their lane. Allow them to move across your path as they travel around the roundabout."

Cyclists, horse riders and horse drawn vehicles may stay in the left-hand lane when they intend to continue across or around the roundabout. Drivers should take extra care when entering a roundabout to ensure that they do not cut across cyclists, horse riders or horse drawn vehicles in the left-hand lane, who are continuing around the roundabout."

Do you agree with the proposed changes to Rule 186 that:

	Yes	No	Don't know?
you do not overtake cyclists within their lane?			
you allow cyclists to move across your path?			
cyclists may stay in the left lane when continuing across or around the roundabout?			
horse riders may stay in the left lane when continuing across or around the roundabout?			
horse drawn vehicles may stay in the left lane when continuing across or around the roundabout?			

If no, why not?

The Bikeability Delivery guide teaches that cyclists should use the appropriate lane for the riders journey, e.g the left lane for turning left and straight on, and right lane to turn right. A cyclist should also always ride in primary position / centre of the lane when negotiating a junction or roundabout.

Applying different rules to a roundabout depending on the road user is a confusing thing to do, we advocate not doing so.

Programme professionals also expressed disquiet around the idea that cyclists could find themselves close to the point of entry and exit on roundabouts, whilst continuing to proceed around the roundabout, putting them in a vulnerable position, and less visible to others around them.

However the first paragraph mentioned is good:

"You should give priority to cyclists on the roundabout. They will be travelling more slowly than motorised traffic. Give them plenty of room and do not attempt to overtake them within their lane. Allow them to move across your path as they travel around the roundabout."

Although we strongly suggest that the following paragraph is changed to:

"Cyclists should choose the correct lane which corresponds to their exit route, e.g the left lane for turning left and straight on, and right lane to turn right, and ride in the centre of this lane. You should signal your intention to move left or right when necessary, provided you have full control of the cycle."

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to using the road rule 195)



No



Don't know? (Go to using the road rule 195)

Disagrees with Rule 186 using the road wording: signals and position

Why not?

See comments above

Using the road

Rule 195 on zebra crossings will be updated to include reference to parallel crossings and also amended to advise drivers to give way to pedestrians and cyclists waiting to cross at a zebra crossing or parallel crossing. This rule restates guidance in Rule 17 and reinforces Rule H2. The additional proposed text is:

"[Zebra crossings] you should give way to pedestrians waiting to cross

Parallel crossings are similar to zebra crossings, but include a cycle route alongside the black and white stripes.

As you approach a parallel crossing:

- look out for pedestrians or cyclists waiting to cross and slow down or stop
- you should give way to pedestrians or cyclists waiting to cross

- you **MUST** give way when a pedestrian or cyclist has moved onto a crossing
- allow more time for stopping on wet or icy roads
- do not wave or use your horn to invite pedestrians or cyclists across; this could be dangerous if another vehicle is approaching
- be aware of pedestrians or cyclists approaching from the side of the crossing.

A parallel crossing with a central island is two separate crossings."

Do you agree with the proposed change to Rule 195 to give way to pedestrians and cyclists waiting to cross at a parallel crossing?



Yes (Go to using the road Rule 195 wording: zebra and parallel crossings)



No



Don't know? (Go to using the road Rule 195 wording: zebra and parallel crossings)

Disagrees with Rule 195 using the road: give way at parallel crossings

Why not?

Using the road Rule 195 wording: zebra and parallel crossings

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to using the road further comments)



No



Don't know? (Go to using the road further comments)

Disagrees with Rule 195 using the road wording: zebra and parallel crossings

Why not?

We suggest the following point is changed from:

“you should give way to pedestrians or cyclists waiting to cross”

To

“you must give way to pedestrians or cyclists waiting to cross”

This is a better reflection of the hierarchy of road users, and should encourage the rule to be adhered to more.

Using the road

There are several other changes within the using the road section (and we recommend reading the chapter before answering). Some of these changes are to update The Highway Code to recognise facilities and practices that are already in use on the highway. Other proposed amendments are to provide guidance on safe behaviour and practices. In summary, some of the changes include, but are not limited to:

- strengthening priority for cyclists
- road positioning at junctions to ensure the safety of cyclists and motorcyclists
- further clarity on behaviour at Advanced Stop Lines
- keeping crossings clear of traffic

Do you have any further comments about the changes to the rules on using the road?

Nothing to add that has not been included in other places, apart from reiterating that a cyclists should ride in the centre of their lane at all junctions and road narrowings.

Road users requiring extra care

The chapter on 'road users requiring extra care' in The Highway Code provides further advice on proceeding with caution around pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and motorcyclists, as the main vulnerable user groups. It also strengthens the advice in earlier chapters on giving these groups priority in certain circumstances.

Rule 213 will be amended to advise that cyclists may ride in the centre of the lane for their safety. The additional proposed text is:

"On narrow sections of road, at road junctions and in slower-moving traffic, cyclists may sometimes ride in the centre of the lane, rather than towards the side of the road. Allow them to do so for their own safety, to ensure they can see and be seen. Cyclists are also advised to ride at least a door's width or 0.5m (metres) from parked cars for their own safety."

Do you agree with the proposed changes to Rule 213?



Yes (Go to rule 213 road users requiring extra care: cycling on narrow roads)



No



Don't know? (Go to rule 213 road users requiring extra care: cycling on narrow roads)

Disagrees with Rule 213 road users requiring extra care: cycling on narrow roads

Why not?

Rule 213 road users requiring extra care: cycling on narrow roads

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to road users requiring extra care further comments)



No



Don't know? (Go to road users requiring extra care further comments)

Disagrees with Rule 213 road users requiring extra care: cycling on narrow roads

Why not?

Amended text on question 213 advises drivers on cyclists' road positioning, but we believe the wording should be strengthened, so this is expected by other road users. We also suggest removing the reference to 0.5 metres from a parked car, as this distance is not sufficient.

We suggest the following text is adopted:

"On narrow sections of road, at road junctions and in slower-moving traffic, cyclists should ride in the centre of the lane, rather than towards the side of the road. Allow them to do so for their own safety, to ensure they can see and be seen. Cyclists are also advised to ride at more than a doors width from parked cars for their own safety."

Road users requiring extra care

There are several other changes within the road users requiring extra care section (and we recommend reading the chapter before answering). Some of these changes are to recognise facilities and practices that are already in use on the highway, or to reinforce advice stated in other rules within The Highway Code.

Do you have any further comments about other changes proposed in the chapter on road users requiring extra care?

No

Waiting and parking

The main change to the chapter in The Highway Code on 'waiting and parking' is the introduction of a new technique, commonly known as the 'Dutch Reach', that advises road users to open the door of their vehicle with the hand on the opposite side to the door. The additional proposed text is:

"you should open the door using your hand on the opposite side to the door you are opening, e.g. use your left hand to open a door on your right-hand side. This will make you turn your head to look over your shoulder. You are then more likely to avoid causing injury to cyclists or motorcyclists passing you on the road, or to people on the pavement"

Do you agree with the proposed change to Rule 239?



Yes (Go to rule 239 waiting and parking: Dutch reach)



No



Don't know? (Go to rule 239 waiting and parking: Dutch reach)

Disagree with Rule 239 waiting and parking: Dutch reach

Why not?

Rule 239 waiting and parking: Dutch reach

Is the proposed wording easy to understand?



Yes (Go to waiting and parking further comments)



No



Don't know? (Go to waiting and parking further comments)

Disagree with Rule 239 waiting and parking wording: Dutch reach

Why not?

Waiting and parking

The only other change in the section on waiting and parking is to provide advice on good practice when charging an electric vehicle (also Rule 239).

Do you have any further comments about the other change proposed to Rule 239 on waiting and parking?

No

Annexes

The annexes to The Highway Code provide useful advice for drivers and riders. We are proposing additional new text to Annex:

- 1 on 'you and your bicycle' aims to ensure that riders are comfortable with their bike and associated equipment. The proposed new text will recommend cycle training
- 6 provides useful advice to drivers of motorised vehicles on how to undertake simple maintenance checks to ensure the safety and road worthiness of the vehicle, the proposed new text will recommend daily walkaround checks for commercial vehicles

Do you have any comments about the changes proposed to:

annex 1?

The text in the annex must have the correct website addresses, (it currently does not) and must signpost correctly. We suggest an alternative text below:

“Cycle training: If you are an inexperienced cyclist or have not ridden for a while, consider taking a cycle training course.

Most councils offer national standard cycle training such as Bikeability and in certain areas this is free of charge. Training can help build up your skills and confidence.

There are three levels to Bikeability, which teaches the application of the following four core functions in increasingly complex and busy road environments:

- Making good and frequent observations
- Choosing and maintaining the most suitable riding positions
- Communicating intentions clearly to others
- Understanding priorities on the road, particularly at junctions.

For more information, see www.bikeability.org.uk
<https://www.cycling.scot/bikeability-scotland>”

Please remove the link to Bikeability Wales – they are an independent charity local to Swansea, who happen to use the name ‘Bikeability’. They are not a national training administrator like The Bikeability Trust or Cycling Scotland. Wales does not currently have a national approach to cycle training.

annex 6?

Other comments on The Highway Code

Do you have any further comments regarding the proposed amendments to The Highway Code which focus on safety improvements for cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders?

The Bikeability Trust is available for further discussion on the points raised above and in the formal submission. Once again we would like to thank the DfT for the opportunity to contribute to the consultation for proposed changes to The Highway Code.

Final comments

Any other comments?

We think it is vitally important that a robust national awareness campaign for behavior change is undertaken to disseminate the changes, without which, a significant number of excellent changes will be rendered ineffective.