

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps I should begin by explaining why I am taking the trouble to write to you. Why is this issue of cycle helmet compulsion so important?

I think there are two main reasons. The first is that you should be very concerned about the impact on **respect for the rule of law** and on the **relationship between the States and the people** if this Law goes ahead. These two things are vitally important elements of our society. And yet I believe that the proposed helmet law will undermine both. I return to this later.

And the second reason I write to you is that the emphasis of this proposed action by the States – that is, to make cycle helmet wearing compulsory – is so utterly wrong-headed. The message it sends out is so completely at odds with what the States should be doing.

BUILDING A CYCLING CULTURE

We should be building a cycling culture. We should be encouraging and nurturing our children into cycling so that the habit stays with them for life, along with the resulting health benefits. We should be training up the parents to be good role models. We should be encouraging our older people to get back in the saddle and/or cycle more.

At present the opposite is happening, especially with regard to our children. We send them (and their parents) a message that among all the activities they can be engaging in (amongst them sitting in front of a large or tiny screen doing nothing active at all) cycling is so inherently dangerous that it alone requires putting on protective headwear. And by doing so we store up massive problems of public health and lose out on very many individual and social benefits.

And yet children like nothing more. When I taught a couple of children to cycle as a sideline from my cycling business, the sense of relief and release was palpable. And here is what a parent said after the Sustrans BikeIt programme had taught his son to ride a bike: “I just wanted to thank you for teaching my son to ride a bike. I tried, but I was hopeless. Before you had to crowbar him away from the computer, but now there’s no stopping him when it comes to his bike, and you can’t imagine how proud I was when he says that cycling is now his hobby.”¹

Cycling can be one of the great joys of childhood. The freedom and independence it gives to the child and to the young person the child turns into, is priceless. And as they ride they are also learning about themselves, their capabilities and limitations, about social systems (traffic rules), about looking after themselves and about risk. (Of course, in all this they

need the right amount of encouragement and support and the right amount of “be careful, because . . .”) And in learning all these things they are learning to become better adults.

I have just been one of the leaders of a cycling weekend here at Bamford. In the opening session participants shared their cycling experiences, from learning to ride to the most memorable moments of their cycling careers. I haven't laughed so much in weeks, or been filled with such a sense of happiness. Why?

Because the memories took us all back to the wonder of learning to ride, the freedom and fun it bestows, to the amazing experiences and encounters it leads to.

My daughter teaches in a York school. In honour of the Tour de France they have been designing “the bicycle of the future,” and they have done an “all-in-yellow” fashion show. The school has been consciously trying to engage the children with the world of cycling. In York the proportion of adults in 2011 who cycled at least 5 times a week was the third highest in England at 10 per cent and the number cycling at least once a week was 25% - an increase of two per cent on the year before. ⁱⁱ

There are many videos on the web of what a cycling culture really looks like – in Holland. They can be charming, humorous, stylish, but what leaps out of all of them is that cycling is everyday and normal. Cycling? You just do it – like breathing. This short video gives you an idea, speeded up so it does not take too much of your time. ⁱⁱⁱ

You have it in your hands to recommend that Jersey moves in this direction, towards a positive future in transport, towards a cycling culture (one which would incidentally promote walking as well) or whether Jersey moves to promote the message that cycling is so dangerous that you have to have a helmet on to do it at all.

THE BENEFITS OF A CYCLING CULTURE

I am sure you are aware of some or all of the benefits which would affect the island as a whole, and individuals, if cycling were to increase. Just as a handy aide-memoire here is a list:

- **vastly improved health among all sections of the population due to the direct effects of increased riding;**
- **likely reduction in number and severity of accidents;**
- **better air quality with a consequent reduction in respiratory disease;**
- **better and less stressful environment in our urban areas**

- **lower health costs due to all of the above;**
- **social inclusion as cycling is an activity accessible to all and which allows access to the whole island for all;**
- **reduced congestion: congestion in Jersey is sensitive to small increases or decreases in traffic levels. The 7-8% who commute to work already make a big difference to reducing congestion on our roads.**
- **reduced CO2 emissions;**
- **reduced dependence on fossil fuel supplies;**
- **reduced need for car parking leading to more productive use of precious space in our urban areas- housing, parks, play spaces. ^{iv}**
- **Increased attraction for cycling visitors**
- **Not to mention the sheer joy of cycling (especially for a child) and the increased contact with our surroundings and with other people that cycling brings, as I mentioned before.**

I believe that helmet compulsion would reduce the amount of cycling on the island. This will in turn put at risk all the benefits listed here. Remember that it is not just child helmet wearing compulsion we are talking about here. Andrew Green has made his intentions very clear. If this law goes through he will try to make helmet compulsion apply to everybody.

There is of course one caveat. The notion that helmet compulsion depresses cycling rates is disputed. I deal with this question in a later section.

These benefits of successfully creating a cycling culture are pretty self-explanatory. They fall both to individuals and to the States, as they in many cases reduce costs (health) or release resources (land) or fulfil the strategic aims of the States (promoting social inclusion).

I will expand on just three of them: first the claim of vastly improved health, second the claim about road accidents and third the effect on tourism.

Cycling brings great improvements in health

The 2009 annual report by the Chief Medical Officer for England said: “The potential benefits of physical activity to health are huge. If a medication existed which had a similar effect, it would be regarded as a ‘wonder drug’ or ‘miracle cure’”

Regular physical activity has been shown to reduce the risks of developing colon cancer, breast cancer, diabetes, stroke and high blood pressure; to help existing sufferers to control

high blood pressure and body weight; to build and maintain healthy bones, muscles and joints (thus reducing the risk of osteoporosis); to improve balance, co-ordination, mobility, strength and endurance; to reduce depression and anxiety; and to promote psychological well-being.

And cycling is an easily available and cheap way of getting exercise, and one which is easy to fit in to the daily routine. Also because the bike bears a person's weight, cycling can be a path to exercise for people with joint or weight problems.

People who cycle regularly in mid-adulthood typically enjoy a level of fitness equivalent to someone 10 years younger and their life expectancy is two years above the average.^v

Just to remind you of the scale of Jersey's obesity epidemic: an estimated 55% of adults in Jersey are overweight (of which 17% are obese) and an estimated 40% of 5 year old children are overweight (of which 12% are obese).^{vi}

Tourism

The market for cycling holidays is huge. In the UK The number of people taking cycling holidays was 450,000 in 2006, a 30% increase from 2005.^{vii} Around 5.6 million German citizens every year take a cycling holiday lasting several days.^{viii} 5 million Germans a year take a cycling holiday. And when I ran a cycle hire and tours company I knew that for 20% of Dutch visitors to the island a bike is their principle means of transport

Clearly if we achieve a cycling culture, with good facilities for cyclists and a feeling of safety everywhere, then we stand to do well in the cycling holiday stakes. And conversely if we go into reverse, then we may lose out. Many in Holland and Germany, and maybe the UK as well, will shake their heads in amazement at a law forcing people to wear helmets.

I am not saying there would be a certain drop in visitors. I am saying you should find out what the impact on Tourism might be. It is too important to leave to chance and airy assurances from a Minister.

Road accidents

Below is a chart showing the road accidents in Jersey from 2010 to 2012.

ROAD ACCIDENTS IN JERSEY NUMBER AND COST 2010 TO 2012					
	number	average cost of accident	total cost		
2012					
slight	282	£21,556	£6,078,792		
serious	55	£206,791	£11,373,505		
fatal	2	£1,820,760	£3,641,520		
TOTAL			£21,093,817		
2011					
slight	300	£21,556	£6,466,800		
serious	48	£206,791	£9,925,968		
fatal	1	£1,820,760	£1,820,760		
TOTAL			£18,213,528		
2010					
slight	314	£21,556	£6,768,584		
serious	65	£206,791	£13,441,415		
fatal	3	£1,820,760	£5,462,280		
TOTAL			£25,672,279		

Why do I include this chart? Firstly it shows the huge cost to society of road accidents. If some of that cost was spent in well targeted prevention, it would save all kinds of accidents, including those involving cyclists.

Secondly, compared with motorised traffic, cyclists impose very little danger on other road users. Typically between 3 and 7 third parties are killed in Britain in fatal crashes involving a cycle per year, compared with around 1,600 third party fatalities involving cars (600 passengers; 650 pedestrians; 75 cyclists; 250 motorcyclists) * So if the number of cyclists reduces and the number of motorists increases as a result of helmet compulsion then safety on our roads will be made worse.

Thirdly, this effect is enhanced by drink. If you ride your bike home from the pub having had one too many and have an accident the person most likely to be hurt is you. If however you are at the wheel of a car, than it is far more likely that someone else will get injured or killed in the event of an accident.

Note that these observations take into account Andrew Green's stated intention to pursue compulsion for everyone in Jersey if and when child helmet compulsion is achieved. This is entirely reasonable – for that is where we are headed if this law goes through.

DOES HELMET COMPULSION REDUCE CYCLING?

This is indeed one of the two key questions. (The other being – is there any evidence that helmets would reduce serious injury in Jersey children? – see next section)

In Australia statistician Robinson showed that the helmet compulsion laws brought in in various states there did reduce cycling. Then there came a counter claim that cycling levels have “bounced back”.

But they haven't according to this research:

Australian cycling boom a myth

According to the University of Sydney, claims that cycle use in Australia has recovered from the falls brought about by helmet laws are a myth.

The study, published in the journal *World Transport Policy and Practice*, demonstrates that on a per capita basis there were 37.5 percent fewer Australians riding bikes in 2011 than in 1985-86. Population growth has been three times that of recent increases in cycling trips.

While Australia's reported cycling 'boom' over the past decade has seen increasing numbers of cyclists, there has been an effective decline in per capita cycling participation over 25 years, according to the study.

"Well over half a million more Australians could be riding bicycles if we didn't have mandatory helmet laws, according to research I conducted last year which showed one in five adults surveyed in Sydney said they would ride a bicycle more if they did not have to wear a helmet," Professor Rissel said.

Australia has a low cycling rate compared with most countries and the international consensus is that the mandatory bicycle helmet laws, introduced in 1990-1992, are a significant contributor to this lack of participation.

Thu 28 Jun 2012 ^{xi}

Both Robinson's original work and this study showing that the cycling bounce-back has not happened are contested. Cycle helmet wearing compulsion is a very hot issue in Australia! TRL's advice to you on this question will itself be part of the debate.

New data from Alberta in Canada however has not been contested as far as I know:

"A helmet law for Alberta

A helmet law for cyclists under 18 was introduced in Alberta, Canada, on 1 May 2002.

Edmonton – 59% reduction in children's cycling by 2004

Cyclists were counted in Edmonton (a city in Alberta), in 2000 (pre-law) and 2004 (post-law). The percentage of cyclists under 18 fell from 26% in the pre-law survey, to 15% post-law ([Hagel et al, 2006](#)), suggesting that the law discouraged substantial numbers of youngsters from cycling. Compared to adults who were not required to wear helmets, children's cycling (<13 years) fell by 59%, with a 41% reduction for teenagers aged 13-17 ([Hagel et al, 2006](#)).

Wider surveys – 56% reduction in children cycling and 27% reduction in teenagers, by 2006

Comprehensive survey results were published in 2011 in a PhD thesis ([Karkhaneh, 2011](#)). The data were collated from observational studies of Albertan cyclists in several cities, involving 330 hours of pre-law observations in 2000, and 313 hours of observation post-law in 2006.

The survey showed a large and significant 56% decrease in children's cycling, confirming the large decrease in children's cycling noted in the Edmonton survey, 2 years earlier. The greatest decreases were at schools (68% decrease), on commuter routes (41% decrease) and in residential areas (37% decrease).

There was also a significant 27% decrease in teenage (13-17 years) cycling. In contrast, there was a 21% increase for adults, who were not required to wear helmets. ([Karkhaneh, 2011](#))”^{xii}

If the TRL tell you what they think on this question of cycling rates being hit by helmet compulsion, then I would be grateful if you can send me and others their work. I am intrigued, for example, how the same Australian data can yield opposite conclusions when handled by different statisticians! What is clear is that the dust has not settled on this question, however I have looked carefully at a lot of papers and I believe that the ayes have it – that is, cycle helmet wearing compulsion does depress cycling rates.

Even helmet promotion reduces cycling

One pointer to the truth of the statement that cycle helmet wearing compulsion does depress cycling rates is that there is evidence that helmet promotion alone, without legislation, depresses cycling rates. The main mechanism would be the same. Both helmet promotion and compulsion strongly suggest that cycling is unusually dangerous, which will obviously put people off.

[Both Denmark and the Netherlands] “have long-established cycling cultures and extensive infrastructure in place. There are no helmet laws in either country, but Denmark began promoting cycle helmets for children in the early 1990s and since 2008 has had strong promotions for all cyclists. Data available from Statistics Denmark show national cycle use fell by 25% between 1993 and 2001 (3.1Bn to 2.3Bn kilometres). Whereas in the Netherlands the government has been more clearly supportive of cycling programmes and has eschewed helmet promotion. The Dutch Bicycle Master plan shows cycle use remained constant or slightly increased in the same years.”^{xiii}

Could it be that the publicity drive by Headway, featuring dramatic pictures of head-injured cyclists in the JEP, has contributed to low child cycling rates in Jersey, by giving an exaggerated and false impression of the risks of cycling?

WHERE IS THE EVIDENCE THAT HELMETS WOULD PROTECT OUR CHILDREN?

Indeed, where is it? Scrutiny is evidence-based. I invite the panel to find out what the reality is of child head injury in Jersey. How many child accidents involving head injury are reported by A&E? What was the child doing at the time and what caused these accidents? What was the severity of the injuries split by activity? And in the case of cycling-related injuries, you need to come to a considered opinion about what role a cycle helmet would have played and whether a helmet have prevented serious injury. (I use the word “serious” because legislators do not concern themselves with minor scrapes and bruises, at least the people of Jersey would assume that they don’t.)

I do not know the answers. I certainly have seen no evidence myself. You do not know either. But it is your duty to find out and to inform the States. Otherwise you would be putting the States in the position of placing a legal duty on all parents and on all children between 10 and 14 in an area of everyday life, without a shred of evidence that it will have any effect on reducing serious child head injuries.

Indeed it may be worse than that. I believe the evidence shows that helmet compulsion reduces the numbers cycling. **This means that helmet compulsion increases the risk for each cyclist**, because of the so-called “safety in numbers” effect.

In Jacobsen’s vast study of this matter he says: **“A motorist is less likely to collide with a person walking and bicycling if more people walk or bicycle.... This pattern is**

consistent across communities of varying size, from specific intersections to cities and countries, and across time periods.”^{xiv}

You can see Safety-in-Numbers operating all the time with respect to pedestrians in St. Helier, at the Conway Street turning into Broad Street. The redesign of the area has made pedestrians feel more confident, they feel it is more “their” space. There is an intermittent but heavy flow of pedestrians in both directions to and from Lloyds bank and the Post office and all points in between. As a result motorists come round the corner at walking pace.

In all cases more cyclists means safer cycling. More walkers means safer walking. And conversely, fewer cyclists or pedestrians means that the risk for each pedestrian or cyclist increases. A moment’s thought and you can see why this is. Another moment’s thought and you can see why keeping the numbers of cyclists up and increasing is so vital for ensuring their safety.

SO HOW DO WE PROTECT OUR CHILDREN?

One mother I met in St. Mary told me her heart was in her mouth every time her son, about 10 years old at the time, went to see his mate just 600 yards away near St. Mary’s church. She understood what that ride to his friend meant to him, so she let him go. The point is her anguish cannot be relieved by cycle helmet wearing compulsion. He is potentially mixing it with Ronez cement lorries, scaffolding lorries from the depot up our lane, or with giant tractors and trailers. She knew that the answer lay in changing the road conditions. She mentioned speed, she mentioned the size of the vehicles.

Now I gather that her wishes have come true and the traffic in St. Mary will be tamed, just as it has been in St. Aubin, just as it will hopefully be elsewhere. St. Mary will become safer. I am so glad for that mother and others like her. I hope it’s true, that speeds above 20mph will not only be outlawed, but designed out, made impossible. And that is the direction we need to go in to secure real. And that is the way to achieve real protection for our children and real peace of mind for those who care for them.

Real road safety for child cyclists (and indeed all cyclists) would look like this:

- First and foremost, - promote and encourage cycling, as more cyclists means more safety for cyclists as well as all the other benefits. All the other measures feed into this one:

- Second, tackle speed throughout all built-up areas, which usually ties in with what residents want – just look at St. Mary! The evidence is overwhelming: 20mph zones save injuries and lives. ^{xv}
- Third, allocate road space to cyclists (as at Commercial Buildings with the new harbor –side route) or enable safe sharing of the road-space (as on West Hill on the way up to Haute Vallee school, or at the Conway Street/Broad Street junction)
- Good quality cycle training for children, teenagers and adults
- Route awareness campaigns: the best cycling routes are unknown to most islanders, and yet good routes was top of the list of encouragements in JASS 2009
- Positive PR about the health and other benefits
- Bicycle user groups to encourage cycling in the workplace
- Rolling programme to improve cycling facilities, in particular, to reduce cycle/vehicle conflict

Please take these measures to heart.

IMPACT OF CYCLING HELMET COMPULSION ON THE RULE OF LAW

The rule of law

Laws need public consent and public support. Laws enacted without that support are likely to attract the phrase – “the law is an ass” and its implication – “and I don’t see why I should abide by it.” And every time that happens, the rule of law is weakened.

The law is a heavy tool to use. It brings into play the whole apparatus of the criminal justice system: the police and the courts. The States is telling everyone what they must do and what they cannot do. So when the States passes a law, their credibility and that of law itself is on the line.

The laws restricting tobacco use, and now tobacco marketing, are a vivid illustration. When first mooted in the island, the evidence base was solid as a rock, as it still is, but society wasn't quite ready to make the shift. Now as a result of proposals being made, reports being published and discussed, information around what is being done elsewhere, the whole of society has shifted. The States and the people have moved forward together and the relationship between them has been strengthened as a consequence.

Now consider cycle helmet wearing compulsion. The evidence base is weak. The public is split on this question. The issues around it are poorly understood. Public consultation has been zero. I ask you - how can the States pass a law on that basis?

Even the road safety strategy has not gone out to consultation. I don't know if that is the intention. It has been prepared, I understand, with 'input from stakeholder groups'. This is not the same thing as consultation.

I invite the Panel to confirm from the Minister directly that indeed, there has been no public consultation on this law, nor on the Road Safety Strategy (RSS). I invite the Panel to establish that the RSS will go out to consultation. I invite the Panel to ask the Ministers for TTS and Home Affairs how desirable it is for the States to move to legislation affecting every family in the island with no consultation process whatsoever.

I now turn from the issue of the rule of law and the effect of a helmet wearing compulsion law on that to the issue of the credibility of the States.

IMPACT OF CYCLING HELMET COMPULSION ON CONFIDENCE IN THE STATES

I think it is fair to say that public confidence in the States is at a low ebb. Whatever the reasons for this, I would point out that disengagement with politics, and by extension with public life in general is an extremely dangerous phenomenon. It is also costly to the States. Good laws, wise decisions, bolster the reputation of the States. In the light of this, I believe the Panel should ask itself these questions:

Is the helmet compulsion law proportionate or not? What is the exact intention, and will that intention be fulfilled? Are there better ways of achieving the same end?

Is the law proportionate?

There are several points to be made here. First, the question has to be asked, what is the problem? And what is the scale of the problem?

The problem apparently is children suffering serious head injury, with the potential to lead to brain injury, **as a result of cycling**. In the section above headed "where is the evidence that helmets would protect our children?" I invited the panel to find out the true picture regarding child head injuries in Jersey in order to establish "what exactly is the problem"? would the wearing of helmets have made any difference?

The public expects the States to legislate rationally, with a good cause. Otherwise what are you playing at – and your credibility sinks and the disconnect between the public and the States grows ever deeper.

The second point is: what exactly has been the problem with this law? It took 4 years to get from instructions to being published. My guess is that it has to do with the practical and human rights issues around stopping, questioning and charging children and with punishing the parents for what their child is doing maybe 5 miles away. The States have a right to know – what’s wrong with it? What are the difficulties which had to be overcome?

Is the law effective? What is the exact intention of the law, and will that intention be fulfilled?

The intention appears to be to reduce the severity of injuries suffered by children when they ride their bikes. This is because we all want to protect our children. However the law does not do this. It increases the risk of accident for each child rider, as described above at paragraphs zzz about Safety-in-Numbers.

So although the law may reduce the severity of one unfortunate incident, it increases the likelihood of such an accident occurring in the first place.

The law may even be subject to challenge on these grounds – the States have knowingly put each child at greater risk by pursuing a policy which is known to reduce cycling numbers. As this law is known to be the precursor for a general compulsion law this is a serious matter.

Are there better ways of achieving the same end?

Well, the Panel does not know. Nobody knows, maybe the Panel should find out. There are two documents which might answer this question – the RSS (Road Safety Strategy) and the strategy to facilitate and encourage cycling. The first exists, though it has not been published.

No doubt a great deal of work has gone into these, but although TTS were “requested” by the States to produce them by the end of 2011, they have not appeared. How can States members make a considered decision (and thus protect their reputation) on a cycle helmet compulsion law without seeing and considering these two documents?

The RSS Road Safety Strategy no doubt has something to say about how to increase road safety in a holistic way, how to achieve real reductions in accident rates. Again, the Panel might ask itself, ask the Minister even, whether doing a cycle helmet compulsion law before the RSS is even published is not a serious case of putting the cart before the horse.

Likewise how can the States consider this law when the strategy to facilitate and encourage cycling, requested of the Minister for TTS by the States in December 2010 in a unanimous vote and which should have been published within a year still has not seen the light of day?

QUESTIONS THE PANEL SHOULD ASK

Just to put all the unanswered questions in one place qq

1 Minister for TTS:

How can the States consider this law when both the strategy to facilitate and encourage cycling, and the road safety strategy, requested of the Minister for TTS by the States in December 2010 in a unanimous vote and which should have been published within a year still has not seen the light of day?

2 Minister for TTS: and Minister for Home Affairs:

How can it be desirable for the States to move to legislation affecting every family in the island with no consultation process whatsoever? Does this not undermine the relationship between government and people?

3 Minister for TTS and the Attorney General

What were the problems in drafting this law? What are the difficulties which had to be overcome?

4 Minister for TTS

what exactly is the problem which this law is designed to cure?

5 Minister for TTS

Underpinning the Road safety Strategy, there must be analysis of the cause of accidents in Jersey and what can be done about them. What does the RSS call for? What does this analysis tell us about the relevance of cycle helmets?

5 Minister for TTS

Why is the strategy for facilitating and encouraging cycling so late? What does it call for? What is the relevance of cycle helmets, if any? Has TTS assessed the evidence as to whether helmet compulsion would actually go against the goal of facilitating and encouraging cycling?

6 Minister for Health and social services:

How many child accidents involving head injury are reported by A&E year by year ? What was the child doing at the time and what caused these accidents? What was the severity of the injuries split by activity?

8 Minister for Health and social services:

Has the health department done any analysis on the ageing population and specifically how medical and care costs are related to the state of health of that population? What is their position on how the health of that group can be improved, both in the interests of the people concerned but also in the interests of the taxpayer?

9 Minister for EDD

What has the Tourism department done to assess the impact on tourism of this law? Particularly on the Dutch and German markets?

Will visiting children really be upbraided in front of their bewildered parents by policemen? And will those parents be fined?

CONCLUSION

Cycling brings many benefits, both to those who cycle and to the wider community. Helmet compulsion cuts the numbers cycling, reduces these benefits and increases the risk for those cyclists who remain. Focussing on helmets distracts attention away from other more effective ways of improving cyclist safety.

Jersey could become a cycling island

All the conditions are there: Jersey is small and compact; there are numerous good routes, both for tourists and for residents (marked already on the (now rare) Jersey Cycling Map); Jersey is a beautiful and rewarding place to get around by bike; what is for most people the ride into work is downhill or flat, and the hill is on the way home where a nice shower can await you.

and Jersey should become a cycling island

The health benefits and the environmental benefits are so great – we should press ahead with a positive strategy for a green and pleasant island instead of the negative cul de sac of helmet compulsion. There are benefits to tourism, to planning – less space taken up by car parks, valuable space in an island where land is at a premium – to education and the workplace as people arrive in a more alert and ready state.

And there are benefits there for the taking for each one of us – independence and the pleasure of cycling in one of the best places in the world to do so.

Daniel Wimberley

7th July 2014

-
- i Source Sustrans Bike It Project review 2010
- ii Source York City Council Press release based on DfT (Department for Transport) annual statistics. See http://www.york.gov.uk/news/article/455/york_remains_a_top_uk_cycling_city
- iii <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n-AbPav5E5M>
- iv Cyclists already save the island roughly 675 car parking spaces in St. Helier alone. This is a huge saving of the island's most precious resource (apart from its people) – its land.
- v All these claims are in the CTC's "Cycling and Health" briefing and can be found, with references, at http://www.ctc.org.uk/sites/default/files/file_public/health-and-cyclingbrf.pdf
- vi Source WQ 23rd February 2010. For full text see Appendix zzz
- vii source – *Mintel, reported by the BBC*
- viii Source: market research institute Trendscape acting on behalf of the European Parliament, cited in press release for Eurobike 2010. See here: http://www.eurobike-show.com/eb-en/press/press-releases.php?obj_id=142&sMode=detail
- ix Source Written Question 1240/5(7939) 5th November 2013
1240/5(7939)
- x Data from: "Assessing the actual risks faced by cyclists" Wardlaw MJ 2002. *Traffic Engineering + Control*: Dec 2002 p352-356
- xi See <http://www.cyclehelmets.org/1207.html?NKey=95>
- xii See <http://www.cyclehelmets.org/1250.html>
- xiii Wardlaw "Peer review of proposal for cycle helmet legislation: "States of Jersey – Compulsory Wearing of Cycle Helmets" in P.4/2010 (Amd), page 32
- xiv From abstract of Jacobsen P. *Safety in numbers: more walkers and bicyclists, safer walking and bicycling*. *Injury Prevention* vol. 9 pp205-209, 2003. Jacobsen studied walking and bicycling in 68 California cities; Walking, bicycling, and moped riding in 47 Danish towns; Bicycling in European countries; Walking and bicycling in European countries; Bicycling in the United Kingdom, 1950–99; Bicycling in the Netherlands, 1980–98.
- xv "Typically within **Hull**, 20 mph zones have achieved reductions in injury accidents of:
- Total accidents -56 per cent
 - Killed & seriously injured accidents -90 per cent
 - Accidents involving child casualties -64 per cent
 - All pedestrian accidents -54 per cent
 - Child pedestrian accidents -74 per cent. "
- Source report of Tony Kirby, Safety Engineer, Traffic Services, March 2002 to the Select Committee on Transport, Local Government and the Regions Appendices to the Minutes of Evidence Memorandum by Kingston upon Hull City Council (RTS 152)

PACTS 2004 gives a lower figure: "In Hull, for example, 20 mph zones have reduced cyclist casualties by 38 per cent and child cyclist casualties by 50 per cent..." I suspect this figure has been corrected to take account of the national downward trend in accidents at that time.

In **London** it is the same story. Grundy et al looked at 399 20 mph zones across the city. **Results** The introduction of 20 mph zones was associated with a 41.9% (95% confidence interval 36.0% to 47.8%) reduction in road casualties, after adjustment for underlying time trends. The percentage reduction was greatest in younger children and greater for the category of killed or seriously injured casualties than for minor injuries. . . . The observed reductions were largest for the youngest children (0-5 and 6-11).

Source: “Effect of 20 mph traffic speed zones on road injuries in London, 1986-2006: controlled interrupted time series analysis”; Grundy et al 2009 See at <http://www.pacts.org.uk/docs/pdf-bank/b4469.pdf>