

Changes to The Highway Code: The Bikeability Trust response

Programme professionals survey

The Bikeability Trust welcomes the opportunity to engage in the DfT's consultation on The Highway Code.

The Bikeability Trust is a Charitable Incorporated Organisation whose object is to advance the education of the public in general (and particularly amongst children) on the subject of cycling.

High-quality cycle education enables confident and enjoyable cycling, raises awareness of skillful cycling among all road users, and contributes to better transport, health and wellbeing.

The Trust manages, develops and promotes the Bikeability programme, supports local Bikeability commissioners, schemes and instructors, and distributes Bikeability award materials.

To accompany our formal response, the Bikeability Trust has sought to engage with all Bikeability programme professionals prior to collating a response. This includes gathering feedback from our Grant Recipients including Local Authorities and School Games Organisers, Bikeability training providers and Bikeability instructors. The Bikeability Trust received 181 individual responses. Raw data is available on request.

For each question relevant to cycling and cycle training in the Highway Code consultation, we have shared the responses of the Bikeability professionals to the consultation questions, along with a summary of direct quotes and comments that illustrate concerns, issues or support.

Do you agree with the introduction of new Rule H1?

Yes	93.85%
No	3.91%
Don't know	2.23%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

This new hierarchy of responsibility needs to be widely publicised in a way to engender the principle of making everybody's journey a safer journey rather than trying to get somewhere in a hurry or quickly.

If ALL users are to be aware of the Highway Code, including pedestrians, horse riders and young cyclists, then massive promotional activity needs to happen as soon as the changes are made.

My own view is that if all drivers knew what it was like to be a vulnerable road user they would then automatically have a better understanding and hopefully be more aware when overtaking. Get cycling on the curriculum, ensure all new drivers experience being a vulnerable rider before getting behind the wheel.

I agree with the hierarchy but am concerned about how it will actually be implemented to ensure the safety of more vulnerable road users.

How will this be disseminated to road users beyond learners?

Believe it should say essential not important.

I feel it could benefit from clearer wording on what it means to have greatest responsibility.

Currently, cyclists generally yield to horses. Could this rule be interpreted as cyclists having priority? Being a cyclist, I agree with the order, but I'm concerned about how the rule would be interpreted by some cyclists.

I feel that the wording of H1, should be stronger, using words like must and shall, as opposed to should. I fear that many drivers will disregard clause H1 in its proposed format.

Yes, but consider horse riders more vulnerable than cyclists, and this seems to be wishful thinking with little to suggest road users 'must' take this viewpoint.

I think that horses should have a higher priority than cyclists.

Same as rest of Europe - creates positive culture change.

It should be made clear that this hierarchy will be used in legal action should it be taken

It should be clearly stated that if there is collision with a more vulnerable road user the driver of the larger vehicle will be presumed liable unless proven otherwise. I believe that this is the case in Germany and Holland.

Summary statement:

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.

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

Overall, the changes were welcomed but with amendment needed to address these concerns.

Do you agree with the proposed change to rule 63?

Yes	98.33%
No	1.67%
Don't know	0.00%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

Promotional campaign needed

What has not been addressed is the responsibility of pedestrians to not prevent themselves from hearing cyclists ringing a bell or calling out politely because they are listening to something through headphones or earpieces.

When using shared cycleways people using personal music devices with headphones make it much harder for cyclists to communicate with them. So, recommendations should be given about not using these devices on shared infrastructure. Also, a lot of dog walkers do not keep the animals under control such as having them on very long leads or just letting them run around. Guidance on the etiquette of dog walkers should be given.

It is a real issue on the significant increase of dog walkers on shared spaces who continually have them off the lead and very nearly or do bring you off your bike and then they try and put the blame on you if you challenge them The local councils should put more signage stating dogs must be on a lead .

Many pedestrians and horse riders are fixed to headsets and mobile phones and rarely hear. Horse riders particularly wish to have a voice contact as anything else startles the animal.

Include calling out 'politely to horses and their riders when approaching from the rear', with 'well in advance'. It works!

Ringing your bell to horse riders may spook the horse!

give the pedestrian, horse rider or horse drawn vehicle time to react to your bell or call, by slowing down.

when approaching horse riders from behind it is better to give a verbal warning as ringing a bell can startle a horse

Give pedestrians and horse riders space as you pass, just as cyclists are entitled to as least as much space as a car.

Do not use a bell with horses as it can startle them it is best to call out Good Morning/ Afternoon

Particularly important to recognize other path users may not hear or see cyclists easily. Also promoting safer interaction with horses is to be encouraged.

Summary statement:

98% of Bikeability professionals agree with the introduction of Rule 63, however there were some consistent themes:

- The issue of listening to music as a pedestrian and being unaware of cyclists.
- Concerns over the use of a bell and the anxiety this can transmit to horses.
- Over-crowding on shared spaces and the conflict this can result in.

The changes were roundly welcomed with a few concerns as outlined above.

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

In the centre of your lane on quiet roads?

Yes	83.98%
No	12.71%
Don't know	3.31%

In the centre of your lane in slower moving traffic?

Yes	83.89%
No	11.67%
Don't know	4.44%

In the centre of your lane when approaching junctions?

Yes	96.09%
No	3.35%
Don't know	0.56%

At least 0.5 metres away from the kerb on busy roads?

Yes	83.43%
No	15.47%
Don't know	1.10%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

Distance from the kerb/ positioning

3b does not read correctly as it states that you should move to the left straight away. It should say if traffic speeds up move to the left when safe to do so.

Re point1 it should be "move over to the left WHEN AND if you can do so safely." (Too many motorists expect cyclists to just "get out the way" immediately) There should also be a point about assessment of risk by a cyclist is likely to be very different to that of a motor vehicle driver in their comfortable cab who often do not appreciate the risks faced by the cyclist.

A further 25+ comments calling for the recommended distance to be either 1 metre from the kerb or 1 metre to the left of traffic flow.

Alignment with National Standard / Bikeability Delivery Guide:

The emphasis is wrong and infers that cyclists should move to left when vehicles approach behind. you should ride in centre of lane when you need to see better, be seen better or when it is not safe for vehicles to overtake you. You should ride in the centre of your lane when you are matching the speed of the traffic flow. you should move over to the left when you consider that it is safe for vehicles behind to overtake you.

Point 1: - Instead of using the term 'basic positions' to describe where to ride on the road, use 'key positions' or something similar. When riding in the 'centre of your lane', it should include 'so that you can see what is ahead of you more clearly'; i.e.. 'see & be seen!' In respect of moving to the left in 'slower moving traffic', it depends upon the speed of the flow. If a cyclist does this in a flow that is the same speed as the cyclist this will 'invite' the vehicle behind to overtake. Under such circumstances it is better to stay in the Primary Position. Point

I'm not sure whether it is necessary to take the centre of the lane on quiet roads then to move over as and when faster traffic wishes to pass from behind. In the absence of other traffic, the 'secondary' position (0.5 metres from the near side verge) would seem appropriate. My experience of some drivers on "quiet" roads with very light traffic is that they tended to drive faster and to be less alert, seemingly not really expecting to see another road user. Whilst the suggested "primary" position does improve the visibility of the cyclist to approaching road users, in rural roads bordered by hedges this factor is reduced and the time taken to move over to the left could be crucial to avoid an impact from behind.

Primary & Secondary positions should be included by name.

A further 20+ comments calling for greater alignment with Bikeability

Greater clarity needed:

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'.

For 3 b) the wording seems to indicate you should move to the left not ride in the centre of the lane contradicting the rule. It should say that if traffic begins to move more freely, you should move to the left if safe. 0.5 metres is still too close to the kerb

"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" This isn't about cyclists moving over to give priority to faster moving vehicles, it is about safety. The cyclist should only move over to the left if there is then enough room for a faster moving vehicle to pass them safely on the right. The onus should be on the faster vehicle and not the cyclist. This may be the intention of this text, but if so, I don't find the meaning clear. The same can be said for 3b.

In the case of 3d add check behind and move to the centre at pinch points such as pedestrian refuges and double-parked cars to deter overtaking vehicles getting too close.

I believe that on quiet roads riding centre of road could lead to conflict when drivers approach from behind at speed

Do not ride in the centre of your lane on a rural road. you will get swiped out by a car taking a corner too fast...ridiculous. If you ride in the centre of your lane in slower traffic it defeats the bonus of cycling over a car which is to get there faster than a car.

.Summary statement:

Rule 63 generated the highest amount of responses from programme professionals, with over 90 comments being returned.

- 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 and or kerb. Including one who argued that *"A metre away from kerb on busy roads is better, a reduction demeans the cyclist's position in the hierarchy"*.

A lot of comments expressed concern over road positioning, and we have suggested alternatives in our formal response.

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

Yes	93.37%
No	4.67%
Don't Know	1.66%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

Dismount! defeats the whole reason to be seen as part of the traffic! you are in effect an obstruction that should be on a pavement.

As a Cycle Trainer I don't agree with the element of the 'rule' that encourages cyclists to dismount and walk across the junction - seems very defeatist. Otherwise OK.

Dismounting and wheeling a cycle across a junction can prove more dangerous than moving with the traffic flow, especially in heavy traffic conditions and/or complicated junctions. Pulling into the side of the road and waiting for a gap in the traffic to allow the junction to be negotiated when it is safe to do so is a preferential course of action than dismounting.

The code should not be 'encouraging' cyclists to dismount and behave as a pedestrian; fine if an individual wants to do this, but the Code is about 'road use'. The bike is a vehicle and should be respected by other road users. Riders should move into the centre of the 'appropriate' lane well in advance of the junction.

Remove the part about dismounting. the equivalent would be to say 'if you are a nervous driver who doesn't feel safe driving in busy cities, you may prefer to take public transport' and I bet that's not in there.

Delete last sentence. It is unacceptable for cyclists to not be told to dismount, and this advice is likely to be used to attribute blame to bicycle users involved in crashes.

Summary Statement:

General agreement with the spirit but some disquiet reflected above with the notion of dismounting and walking your cycle, as this becomes self-defeating and reflects the view by some that cyclists do not belong on the roads. It certainly does not reflect the hierarchy of road users.

Do you agree with the proposed change to Rule 76?

Yes	85.08%
No	10.50%
Don't know	4.42%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

Greater clarity and consistency

Assuming that this is going straight ahead whilst passing a side road, I believe this rule should tally with the National Standard. A cyclist should move toward the centre of the lane whilst passing a side road instead of undertaking faster-moving traffic. This is what is taught in Bikeability. It seems non-sensical to have a Highway Code rule that contradicts the National Standard

Cycle tracks alongside roads should be continuous with priority at side roads, confirmed by road markings that turning traffic must give way to cyclists going straight ahead.

Please make it clear 'on the main road, when travelling straight ahead at a junction' The wording isn't clear and you may risk cyclists exiting a side road and shooting across the main road, believing they have priority over vehicles turning.

Good guidance, but it is not sufficient. Riders should move into the centre of their lane when passing a side road so that they can see & be seen. The final paragraph implies that drivers of 'long vehicles' can make a left turn when there is a cyclist in the vicinity irrespective of the position of the cyclist.

I don't understand the above wording. On first reading, it sounds like a situation where I am waiting at a crossroads in order to go straight across the junction? And then it doesn't make sense? But I think what it intended to describe is a situation where I'm riding past a junction - I'm on the major road riding past a minor side road? It's not very clear

I don't think "Be particularly careful alongside lorries and other long vehicles, as their drivers may find it difficult to see you." is explicit enough about the massive danger to cyclists of undertaking. This should be much clearer.

Confusing. Cyclist should abide by same rules as other road users.

Filtering past traffic is allowed if safe to do so, with caution, preferably on the right of queuing traffic

Fears around passing vehicles on left and clarity on what road layout is being described

Suicidal. Undertaking at left turns is madness.

This wording is very unclear and I'm not sure what it means. "If you are going straight ahead at a junction" what do you mean? Are you going straight ahead from a minor road into another minor road at a crossroads, in which case how can you have priority over a vehicle turning into the minor road from the major road? If you mean you are going straight ahead on the major road, then of course you have priority over a vehicle turning into the major road from the minor road, but that needs to be specified so as not to cause confusion.

I think it should be made clear that a cyclist should never be to the left of traffic when approaching a junction. They are safer waiting behind (or overtaking on the right if that is possible). To make cyclists believe they have priority, when very few drivers will think that is true, is a recipe for disaster.

NO. very dangerous! reword to: 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). Be aware that some drivers might not see you, particularly when approaching junctions on the left alongside stationary or slow-moving traffic. Watch out for drivers intending to turn across your path. If possible, ride in the centre of the lane to increase your visibility, maintain your speed so drivers are aware of your intention to keep going straight on, make strong eye contact, but be prepared to stop by covering your brakes just in case they turn across your path. 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. Never undertake a long vehicle when there is a chance that they might be turning,"

Your wording is confusing. "Going straight ahead at a junction" sounds as if you have give way lines in front of you at a crossroads. You should make it clear that this is about "passing a side road" and use those words INSTEAD of "going straight ahead". You also make it sound as if the cyclist will be riding to the left (you even say "alongside lorries and other long vehicles", but this practice should be actively discouraged) when actually they should be encouraged to ride in a central or primary position when passing the side road.

I think the wording could be misleading as it we'll possibly encourage cyclists to pass vehicles on the left side of stationary or slow-moving traffic. As is taught in bikeability a cyclist should never pass vehicles on the left side, it is always better to be positions in the centre of your lane where you will be more visible and we'll have better control of any traffic behind you.

The text hints at 'filtering' past stationary traffic - it would be good to clarify filtering techniques.

This needs to be strengthened due to the amount of fatalities particularly at junctions and particularly involving female cyclists and heavy or long vehicles or lorries

. . . make sure that you take the centre of your lane as you pass junctions so you can see, and you can be seen.

The 3rd paragraph should state at junctions, never pass to the left of lorries and long vehicles that may be turning left and be aware that they may have to move to the right if overtaking

The wording is a bit confusing, indicating that the cyclist has priority over a turning vehicle but also warning that the driver of the turning vehicle may not see the cyclist. It needs to be abundantly clear that the road user who is turning is fully responsible for avoiding a collision with anyone else.

Summary statement:

There were serious concerns expressed over the clarity of the wording and whether this may lead to incidents at junctions without greater clarity and accompanied by an effective public education campaign.

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, and should not undertake vehicles which are about to turn left.

Do you have any further comments on changes within the rules for cyclists' section?

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

I am concerned about the guidance in rule 74 where it states it may be safer to move to the left and wait when turning right, other vehicles will not know where you are going and are not likely to give way. You could end up stuck on the left.

"When using a cycle lane, keep within the lane when practicable. When leaving a cycle lane check before pulling out that it is safe to do so and signal your intention clearly to other road users. Use of cycle lanes is not compulsory and will depend on your experience and skills, but they can make your journey safer." Why is this clause being deleted at Rule 63? it is important advice in my view. "ride in single file when riding round bends" this seems like good advice in rule 66 why delete it? "Just before you turn, check for undertaking cyclists or motorcyclists" if this to be deleted in rule 72 make sure that looking over your left shoulder is as important as looking over your right shoulder when turning left in rule 74. I would insert a section about the importance of being able to look over your left and right shoulders when cycling, when to do the look and the need to practice cycling in a straight line when looking before getting onto a busy road.

A campaign to make all road users aware of these changes would be useful as many or not aware of the rules at present so any further changes will not be clear to many road users unless measures are taken to make them aware.

Remind all users that the roads are shared with each other.

There is no mention of filtering, either for or against the practice in the rules for cyclists' section.

Summary statement:

There were more calls for a publicity campaign to accompany any significant changes and consistency with Bikeability teaching. The ethos of sharing the road was mentioned on several occasions and how to embed this into a culture change nationally.

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

Lane?

Yes	95.48%
No	3.39%
Don't know	1.13%

Track?

Yes	91.48%
No	2.84%
Don't know	5.68%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

I would see the clear need for road markings where cycle tracks cross junctions/minor roads to indicate drivers must give way. My 1st read of this rule to me tells me I can undertake vehicles waiting to turn left from major to minor road. The supporting text then tells me how unwise that is as the driver may not see me. I would prefer a position where I can undertake slow moving/static traffic, but the onus is on the cyclist to be able to stop if a vehicle ahead of me turns left. Also needs to be clarified that a cyclist riding on the road turning across a cycle path/track would also have to give way to a cyclist on the cycle track/path

How are these rules to be enforced?

A vehicle slowing or stopping unexpectedly to allow cyclist or pedestrian crossing may have the result of more rear end shunts as the vehicles behind may not see the smaller road users.

More confusion..... words in a book or online mean nothing if no one is forced to read them. New drivers yes - anyone else no.... This is an exercise in shifting responsibility which may have in my opinion an adverse effect and further antagonise motorists in general. This is not the way to change public opinion towards pedestrians, cyclists etc.

Summary statement:

This amendment was widely accepted. Points raised included:

- The need for a robust national campaign to highlight changes to the highway code.
- The need for appropriate road markings on cycle lanes and tracks to embed the changes.
- Concern that priority given to those going straight on at junctions may lead to more accidents.

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

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

National Standard Cycling Training should be a compulsory module on the Car Driving Test.

Driving on a road with vehicles parked either side. An approaching cyclist may be able to pass parked vehicles on their side with "a door and a bit more". Before a vehicle proceeds, they should consider if they will pass too close to the oncoming cyclist, this is irrespective of whether they can remain on their lane and not encroach on the other lane. If proceeding means they will in effect do a 'close pass' they should wait. Vehicles must not overtake a cyclist turning right (yes, it happens, even when delivering Bikeability!)

Yes - Emphasise to both drivers and riders that cyclists are expected to move to the centre of the lane when approaching and passing through width restrictions - such as traffic islands which are part of traffic calming measures - and that drivers should not attempt to overtake cyclists at these points.

Use tv commercials

How are you going to get the new rules across to current driver's? Retesting?

Bikeability cycle training establishes the concept of appropriate road positioning in terms of 'Primary' and 'Secondary'. This terminology should be included in the training undertaken by all road users. If this concept is firmly embedded from the outset, motorists may be less inclined to feel that cyclists are 'in their way' or 'holding them up'.

The motives and intentions are admirable and, in my view, long overdue. One can hope that they will make a positive difference in terms of safety for all. My concern is negative attitudes in all road users and that those most vulnerable will come off worst. The sanctions for those with the potential to cause the most damage need to be sufficient and known about, to be affective. Until then the vulnerable will still need to keep themselves safe.

Summary statement:

A range of points were made, including

- Raising awareness amongst all road users as to what is taught in Bikeability.
- Again, the need for an educational / promotional campaign.
- Need for additional road markings at junctions where cycle tracks cross junctions.

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

Yes	80.66%
No	14.36%
Don't know	4.97%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

Cyclists should avoid passing slower moving traffic on the left - in the case of heavy goods or passenger service vehicles, this should be discouraged in all circumstances, even if the traffic is at a standstill. Where it is safe to do so, passing traffic on the right is possible where there is sufficient space, but care should be taken to allow for oncoming vehicles, traffic pulling out suddenly to the right, and queuing traffic flow resuming, meaning the speed of traffic may match or exceed that of the cyclist, leaving him or her vulnerable towards the centre of the road, without being able to safely pull back into his/her lane.

This may allow cyclist as some do now to behave in a dangerous way - We should tell them to think and not behave with impunity.

It would probably be good to recommend that cyclists pass slower traffic on the right, and point out that they may be less visible, particularly to traffic turning into or from junctions on their left, if they pass traffic on the left. However, passing traffic on the left needs to be allowed as many on road cycle lanes are on the left. I'd also include recommending passing two lanes of slow / stationary traffic on the right of the left-hand lane, but to be aware of vehicles suddenly switching lanes.

Yes, but this underlines the importance of having some Bikeability training, so the cyclist is fully aware of the potential risks

It is worth highlighting that the risks associated with passing on the left are often much greater than on the right.

Mmm...I say not sure as I am a cyclist and am a bit edgy about going past a car on my right, I guess if your confident enough then it can be done but I cringe at the idea of moving traffic on both sides of my bike.

Cyclists should not be allowed to undertake on the left-hand side. Cars are not allowed to do this and neither should cyclists. It is an unsafe practice for all road users and should be the same rule for all. .

Summary statement:

Whilst 80% of respondents agreed with the proposal of passing slow moving traffic on either side, the majority went to great lengths to highlight the inherent dangers associated with passing slow moving vehicles on the left, and particularly at junctions. Consequently, a good many comments were cautionary in their nature.

Wherever cyclists are travelling at the same pace as other road users, they should ride in the centre of the lane.

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

Yes	87.78%
No	8.33%
Don't know	3.89%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

The primary consideration should not be how fast am I going but is it safe to overtake.

giving a speed limit gives the impression its ok to pass at that speed regardless of there not being enough road space to pass safely

It could be confusing giving different passing distances based on speed. Perhaps 2m is best in all situations? It should help reduce the number of incidents and the severity but how is this going to be enforced?

It's confusing and unnecessary to allow a closer pass at speeds less than 30mph, keep it at 2m in all circumstances unless the car is moving at walking pace.

To avoid confusion, it should be a standard 2m for all speeds.

Why have different overtaking distances at different speeds? Keep it simple and make it just the one distance. If 2m is the proposal at 30mph then just make it 2m.

Summary statement:

Despite a very high agreement rate for this question, most comments supported the idea of simplifying the rule to set one distance regardless of speed, and the responses below also reiterate this point. Most respondents feeling that 2.00 metres should be the minimum distance.

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

Yes	86.74%
No	11.05%
Don't know	2.21%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

The minimum distances should be 2m regardless of speed for clarity and certainty for all road users

Should be a minimum of 2 meters at all speeds.

But get rid of the phrase 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). Some people think this means pass close because that's what they do when passing parked vehicles, or in cities with 2 lane roads where each lane is quite narrow vehicles are overtaking very close. Better to stick with a specified distance so there can be no confusion over what is meant.

Make it 2m regardless of speed.

I think a 2m clearance should be a minimum for all occasions. It gives more of a margin for error and is more easily remembered. 1.5 m is still quite scary for some urban cyclists at speeds close to 30mph. The existing HC shows a driver overtaking on the opposite carriageway, giving as much space as it would other vehicles. This should be kept too.

To avoid confusion, it should be a standard 2m for all speeds.

I think that passing any vulnerable road user should be carried out by using the other lane (if clear). This way, the measurements do not come into play (which is hard to enforce). All passing vehicles should move over to the other lane as you would if passing a car. This takes away any grey areas. Cyclists should be treated as all other slower moving vehicles (tractors etc).

I do not think 2 metres is enough space if a vehicle is overtaking at 60mph. Faster than 30mph all overtaking should be done by moving completely into a different lane.

However, this should state you must and that these passing distances are compulsory, not advisory

It should be 2.0m when overtaking a cycle at any speed - why make it complicated when we have all got used to 2.0m social distancing?

Summary statement:

There was a considerable amount of feedback on this issue as well, with almost all comments making a case for a set minimum distance of 2.00 metres.

- Two respondents made an interesting suggestion, one of them putting it in the following way:

I think that passing any vulnerable road user should be carried out by using the other lane (if clear). This way, the measurements do not come into play (which is hard to enforce). All passing vehicles should move over to the other lane as you would if passing a car. This takes away any grey areas. Cyclists should be treated as all other slower moving vehicles (tractors etc, HGV's etc).

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

You do not overtake cyclists within their lane?

Yes	95.03%
No	3.87%
Don't know	1.10%

You allow cyclists to move across your path?

Yes	92.22%
No	3.33%
Don't know	4.44%

Cyclists may stay in the left lane when continuing across or around the roundabout?

Yes	65.00%
No	25.00%
Don't know	10.00%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

Needs a lot of driver re-education

Roundabouts on both slow & fast roads are often driven around at a high speed (sometimes the travel line is almost straight). I think it is highly dangerous for a cyclist to ride around the outer lane of a roundabout unless turning left or, in some cases, taking the 2nd left exit.

Should follow rules cars do...right lane right turn...straight Over in left lane and left for left turn for double lane roundabout

Across yes but not around as this will cause confusion especially for drivers approaching a roundabout who may assume that cyclists may be exiting the roundabout to the road positioning of the cyclist

This causes confusion. Cyclists should be encouraged to take the same lane as motor vehicles to improve visibility and clarity on their intentions.

...but expect the cyclists to take primary position

Although cyclists "MAY" stay in the left lane when continuing "around" the roundabout, I think that cyclist should be in the same lane as cars proceeding around the roundabout and change to the left-hand lane (with the appropriate signal) as they pass the last exit before the one at which they are exiting the roundabout.

Although cyclists may stay in the left lane when turning right (and a driver must prepare for this), this position should not be encouraged.

In Cambridge cycle lanes were used on the outside of roundabouts. This caused a lot of confusion between cyclists and Motorists.

Training and awareness will be vital in this change of rule to avoid collisions.

This makes cyclists much more difficult to see. Far better to encourage them to behave the way other road users do and use the appropriate lane as a driver would. They are more visible and safer because of this.

I think being allowed to keep to the left around an island is a much more comfortable idea than having to go in the middle then have to signal to the left and manoeuvre to go say in to the third exit, I am very uncomfortable about doing that now as when I once attempted this because it was slightly up hill and I was travelling at 8 miles an hour and the cars were doing 30, someone bibbed at me as I was too slow and that didn't help.

The rules of the road should be the same for Everyone, by creating separate sets of rules there is a lot of room for confusion! Having to know what you are allowed to do and what bikes/horses etc can do, there is often enough to think about on roundabouts, let alone a Lot more rules and regulations!

Very dangerous for cyclists to remain in the left-hand lane (if it has 2 lane entry and no arrow markings) if turning right at a roundabout

I feel that this will cause confusion to motorists, and that they will not have a clear idea of the cyclists' intentions on the roundabout. If there were a cycle lane around the roundabout, this would possibly clarify that the motorist is obliged to give way to the cyclist.

I would not feel safe being on the left lane of a large multilane multi exit roundabout while turning right, particularly in a situation where traffic is queuing on the roundabout and I think the risk of a driver not seeing me while exiting the roundabout is too great. Particularly with the proposed rule change that vehicles should allow cyclists to change lane in front of them

Across yes, going right in the left-hand lane? NO. don't make one rule for motorists and another for cyclists it just creates confusion. What i would add is that turning right often sees cars undertaking when you're trying to exit the roundabout. So, a no over or undertaking bit would be nice.

Cyclists should use roundabouts in the same way as any other vehicle.

Cyclists should be encouraged to take up the same road position as any other vehicle when turning at a junction, to ensure that other road users can read the cyclists intention from their road position as well as their signalling

Summary statement:

Significant disquiet was reflected in the comments, largely based on what instructors teach cyclists to do when cycling on roundabouts. The Bikeability Delivery guide teaches that cyclists should use the appropriate lane for the exit and always ride in primary position / centre of the lane. The disquiet centred on the idea that cyclists would find themselves close to the point of entry and exit on roundabouts, putting them in a vulnerable position, less visible to vehicles around them. A significant campaign would be needed to make all road users aware.

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	95.56%
No	2.22%
Don't know	2.22%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

Road users should NOT be required to give way to those waiting to cross at a zebra crossing. They must give way to those on the crossing.

Yes some sense at last, particularly around ZEBRA crossings. Infrastructure and facilitating cyclists and pedestrians in a safer environment is the way to go.

Not "should, but "must"

I think this should say 'you MUST give way to pedestrians waiting to cross'

Very well worded!

these types of parallel crossing should be mandatory where Rule 140 applies to cycle tracks, as drivers will be confused that the same rule (give way to cyclists) applies with and without parallel crossings

Summary statement:

Other than calls for this to be a 'Must' and for consistency with Rule 140, the comments were otherwise almost all very supportive and fewer in number.

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

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

Change 'should not block ASL's' to 'MUST NOT block them'.

Drivers to be made aware of why a cyclist might be in middle of lane and might not pull over to allow overtaking (including cyclist avoiding rough edges to road surface - e. G. country lanes).

Make it really clear that motorised vehicles must not cross the first solid line. Including motorcyclists!

Summary statement:

Calls were made to strengthen the instruction that motorised vehicles should not cross the first solid line at an ASL and they should not be blocked, and to explain further the reason why cyclists may ride in the middle of their lane at times, including on country lanes.

Do you agree with the proposed changes to Rule 213?

Yes	90.56%
No	8.33%
Don't know	1.11%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

Amend text to read, "Cyclists are also advised to ride at least 1 metre from parked cars for their own safety."

0.5 metres should not be included. The distance should be a minimum of 1.5m from parked cars.

A door is not 0.5m it is at least 1 and often 1.5m. Cyclists are taught to ride at least 2m from a parked car for their own safety.

I would strengthen the wording as follows:- "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 BOTH for their own safety AND to ensure they can see and be seen. Cyclists are also advised to ride at least a door's width or 1m (metre) from parked cars for their own safety." Car doors are at least a metre wide and greater clearance is needed

Fine except surely that should read 'a door's width or 1.5m' - this is what the bikeability training says...

Generally, I agree with the sentiment behind the rule, but think keeping clear of car doors needs a much greater safe clearance than 0.5m. 'The width of a door and a little bit more' is a well used training maxim when passing parked vehicles! Car doors, particularly some larger doors on small cars, open much wider. My own car opens to 1.15m. In my experience of delivering cycle training, this is an area often underestimated by both children and adults.

Door width is fine but 0.5m is too small. When I trained as a Bikeability Instructor I was taught "width of a door and a little bit more"

Take away the word "sometimes" it doesn't add anything and might make drivers think it's optional to overtake if the cyclist is too nervous to ride centrally. Just put "cyclists may ride in the centre of the lane".

but doesn't this rule where cyclists ride in the centre of the lane on narrower sections of road, contradict rule 72 where cyclist should move to the left to allow faster vehicles to overtake

Many more comments were in favour of a 2 metre minimum from a parked car, or not including a distance.

Summary statement:

There was a high comment rate for this proposal which was roundly supported but with an adjustment as a minimum distance range of 1.5-2.00 metres. The common-sense argument being that vehicle doors range between 0.75 m to 1.5m and that in Bikeability cyclists are taught to keep a clearance that will deal with this full range and a little more.

One comment read: "I would strengthen the wording as follows:- "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 BOTH for their own safety AND to ensure they can see and be seen. Cyclists are also advised to ride at least

a door's width or 1m (metre) from parked cars for their own safety." Car doors are at least a metre wide and greater clearance is needed"

Do you agree with the proposed change to Rule 239?

Yes	88.40%
No	8.84%
Don't know	2.76%

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

I like the fact you have given the reason for using the other hand to open the door. The speed at which a vehicle door is opened might be something that drivers should be warned about; opening a door a few centimetres can be seen by an oncoming cyclist and allows direct eye contact with the driver. I've known drivers push their door wide open without warning, giving a cyclist no chance at all of stopping or avoiding a collision.

Agree with Dutch Reach part but would like to see further clarifications on the situations below: - that parking on the pavement is only permissible if at least 2m of space is left for pedestrians, wheelchairs, prams etc. - that parking in cycle lanes with a solid white line is prohibited - that as well as lights etc switched off, engines should be switched off if you are parked, no matter how short a time, and clarify this is for local air quality and climate change.

Yes this is good will need a national media campaign to highlight it on all media for all road users not just social media.

Should it perhaps say you MUST look over your shoulder?

I don't think "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" is clear enough about the benefit of seeing approaching cyclists by looking over your shoulder before opening the vehicle door. This could be more explicit so it stands out as important.

I think a visual aid for understanding this is a must.

Can it be the law except for medical exemption?

Some drivers, particularly disabled drivers may not be able to use the Dutch reach method

Summary statement:

Whilst there was some cynicism expressed around the need for this, the overwhelming majority supported the idea in their comments for the introduction of the Dutch Reach and some again calling for a media campaign and one suggesting that a visual aid to support this would be necessary and strengthen its introduction.

Do you have any comments about the changes proposed to annexe 1:

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

As long as this does not mention mandatory helmet use

To make helmets compulsory! They are in the Channel Islands

A good move, hopefully followed up with funding for training

There were a lot of comments in support of the proposed changes.

Summary statement:

Unsurprisingly there was resounding support for many of the proposed changes, although some did suggest that there should be more mention of training throughout and that greater alignment was required between the Highway Code, Bikeability and the National Standards for Cycle Training.

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? With particular reference to rule changes for cyclists 59-82.

Sample of comments from programme professionals:

None of the changes will be of any use unless there is a MAJOR educational campaign AND enforcement of the new rules after the education period

*Cycling should be encouraged as a normal everyday activity and cyclists should dress accordingly. We want more people of all ages cycling as in mainland Europe particularly in the Netherlands where it is highly unusual for cyclists to wear helmets or fluorescent clothing. Rule 59 should reflect this aspiration and be edited and amended as follows: Clothing. You should wear * appropriate clothes for cycling. Avoid clothes which may get tangled in the chain, or in a wheel or may obscure your lights*

Only that the rules should be disseminated widely and enforced, especially driving while on a mobile and exceeding the speed limit wheel its 30 mph. If these amendments are all implemented, it will be a great and much appreciated improvement. Thank you 😊

I work with many drivers who believe cyclists should be using cycle facilities. It should be emphasised that they should only use them if appropriate for the cyclist to do so (i.e. They may be poorly designed, the speed of the cyclist etc). This misconception causes a lot of bad feeling between drivers/ cyclists. Also is it possible to make a mention about 'road tax' or provide an explanation about vehicle excise duty. Another misconception is that cyclists don't pay for the roads and therefore don't deserve to be there.

Car drivers will have to be re-educated, as they currently assume that they are in the right. Because they're bigger.

Could there be an inclusion to advise that all drivers undertake cycle training prior to taking their driving test?

There needs to be a closer tie in between Bikeability Guidance and the rule changes.

Overall very welcoming of the changes in the rules...

Summary statement:

In the main there was considerable positivity in response to the proposals, but many from the industry reiterated their views throughout that changes should be made in line with what is taught to cyclists in Bikeability, the National Standards for Cycle Training and that a very significant promotional campaign would be required to introduce the changes.

A specific point was made to educate road users to realise that it is the cyclist's choice whether they make use of cycling infrastructure, and that this is needed because it causes considerable conflict between cyclists and drivers.