Pedestrians and Cyclists 2015

European Commission

European Road Safety Observatory
www.erso.eu

Transport

CONTENTS

Transport

Transport

1   Introduction

Road travel has become significantly safer for most road users over recent decades, largely through the improvements made by vehicle manufacturers to protect vehicle occupants. The same, however, cannot be said for pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists, who are rapidly becoming the majority of people killed and injured on our roads, particularly in urban areas.

Cycling is often encouraged for environmental and health benefits (Transport for London: "Creating a chain reaction – the London Cycling Plan". 2004), with measures including cycle hire and infrastructure improvements. These policies do provide benefits, but the increase in cycle usage will also lead to increases in collisions, so road safety measures need to be a high priority element in cycle encouragement policies.

It is therefore particularly important to address the safety of these vulnerable road users, and this text aims to provide a better understanding of the problems and issues, and to identify measures that have proven effective in the past.

Every country and every situation is different, so the reader is warned that while a particular measure may have proven to be effective in one situation, it cannot be assumed that similar results will always be achievable in different situations. This is particularly true with regard to 'cultures', which can be different in countries and even regions. There is little research available on this issue but the experience of road safety professionals who have worked on European Projects has led to identifying the importance of understanding local conditions and 'culture' when developing road safety programmes.

1.1   Overview

This text on the safety of pedestrians and cyclists reviews scientific studies on the magnitude and nature of the safety problem, the contributing accident and injury factors and the effectiveness of countermeasures.

An outline of the different road safety aspects of pedestrians and cyclists is presented in the following figure.

Transport

Figure 1: Outline of the different road safety aspects of pedestrians and cyclists

For information on the development of casualty frequencies and trends please consult the Erso Traffic Safety Basic Fact on Pedestrians, 2015 and the Erso Traffic Safety Basic Fact on Cyclists, 2015 on the Data section of the ERSO web site.

Unprotected road users

Walking and cycling are transport modes where relatively unprotected road users interact with traffic of high speed and mass. Pedestrians and cyclists are vulnerable road users and suffer the most severe consequences in collisions with other road users, since they are unprotected against the speed and mass of the other party. Collisions in which they cause injury to others are very rare.

20-40% of all journeys are travelled by cycle or on foot, with the highest percentage in the Netherlands and the lowest in Finland. Trips on foot take place most frequently in Great Britain, whereas bicycle trips are most frequent in the Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden. Some groups of traffic participants walk or cycle more than others. These differences are also reflected in their accident involvement. Walking is particularly important for children below the age of 12 and adults aged 75 and above. The bicycle is used most frequently by adolescents (12-17 years of age).

Transport

Accident characteristics

Pedestrians and cyclists comprise around 22% and 8% of all road traffic deaths in EU countries. The age groups having the highest percentage of pedestrian deaths are children younger than 14 years of age and adults aged 65 years or older and for cyclist deaths, children between 5 and 14 years of age and adults between 65 and 79 years old. The percentages of total deaths for these age groups are more or less twice as high as the average for all age groups.

Most injuries to pedestrians and cyclists occur in urban areas. Motor vehicles (cars, lorries, and buses) account for over 80% of vehicles striking pedestrians and cyclists. Accidents involving pedestrians and cyclists occur frequently at facilities designed for pedestrians and cyclists such as pedestrian crossings, cycle tracks, and cycle lanes. This indicates that more care is needed when designing these facilities. At the same time, pedestrian crossings are usually the location at which roads are most often crossed.

Factors that have been identified as contributory factors to pedestrian and cyclist accidents and injuries are the speed of motorised vehicles, the weight and design of motor vehicles, the lack of protection of pedestrians and cyclists, the attitudes and behaviours of drivers and vulnerable road users, their visibility and vehicle control, and the alcohol consumption of both drivers and of bicyclists and pedestrians.

System-wide countermeasures

Measures that can be taken to reduce the future number of accidents involving pedestrians and cyclists, and/or to decrease the severity of resulting injuries, relate to:

- The planning, design and operation and use of the road network, such as separation of motorised traffic from non-motorised traffic, area-wide speed reduction, the provision of walking and cycling networks.
- Proper design of pedestrian and cyclist facilities.
- Improvement of the visibility of pedestrians and cyclists.
- Vehicle design, in particular crash-friendly car fronts and side-underrun protection on lorries.
- The use of protective devices like bicycle helmets.
- Speed – lower speeds, for example in 30kph Zones, reduce accidents significantly.
- Ensuring compliance of all users with key safety rules including education and training of pedestrians and cyclists as well as drivers.
- Culture – cyclists tend to be safer in countries where there is more cycling.
- Improvements in the emergency medical system and post-accident care aiding users in general.

Special regulations for pedestrians and cyclists

Pedestrians and cyclists are both subject to the traffic rules defined in the Vienna Convention of 1968. In some countries, additional regulations have been defined. These relate to supplementary regulations regarding mandatory equipment to ensure cyclists' visibility (e.g., pedal reflectors, spoke reflectors), standards for children's bicycle seats (e.g., seat attachment, footrests), minimum age for cycling on public roads, and helmet legislation.

Transport

2 Pedestrians and cyclists: unprotected road users

Walking and cycling are transport modes where relatively unprotected road users interact with traffic of high speed and mass. Pedestrians and cyclists are vulnerable road users and suffer the most severe consequences in collisions with other road users, since they are unprotected against the speed and mass of the other involved party. This vulnerability can be expressed in terms of inequality in protection. One way to compare the vulnerability of a particular group of road users against other user groups in serious accidents is using the inequality factor. This is determined, for example, in car-pedestrian accidents by dividing the number of severely injured car occupants by the number of severely injured pedestrians in for instance car-pedestrian accidents. The higher the factor, the higher the vulnerability is. Table 1 shows the inequality factor for pedestrians and bicyclists in pedestrian-other vehicle type accidents and bicyclist-other vehicle type accidents in the Netherlands.

Table 1: Inequality factor in serious accidents involving vulnerable road users: 2004-2008

Mode of transport	Mode of transport accident opponent				
	Bicycle	Moped	Motorcycle	Car or Van	Lorry
Pedestrian	1,7	3,8	3,9	202,6	-
Bicycle	1	1,8	2,4	126,2	245,0

Source: Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment in the Netherlands

Preventing collisions between fast and slow-moving traffic is, therefore, one of the most important requirements for ensuring the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Other measures have to be sought in making the accident opponents less harmful to pedestrians and cyclists, such as in vehicle design.

Of all journeys, 20-40% are travelled by cycle or on foot, with the highest percentage in the Netherlands and the lowest in Finland. Trips on foot take place most frequently in Switzerland, whereas bicycle trips are most frequent in the Netherlands and Denmark (See Table 2). Some groups of traffic participants walk or cycle more than others. These differences are also reflected in their accident involvement. Walking is particularly important for children below the age of 12 and adults aged 75 and above. The bicycle is used most frequently by adolescents (12-17 years of age) (OECD, 1998).

2.1 No speed, no mass, and no protection

Speed is a fundamental risk factor in traffic. Firstly, speed is related to accident rate (Aarts & Schagen van, 2006). From several studies of the relationship between speed and accident rate, we can conclude that higher absolute speeds of individual vehicles are related to an exponential increase in accident rate (Kloeden et al., 1997, 2001). Secondly, speed is related to accident and injury severity. When the collision speed increases, the amount of energy that is released increases as well. Part of the energy will be 'absorbed' by the human body. However, the human body tolerates only a limited amount of external forces. When the amount of external forces exceeds the physical threshold, severe or fatal injury will occur. Hence, higher speeds result in more severe injury. This is particularly true for occupants of light vehicles, when colliding with more heavy vehicles, and for unprotected road users, such as pedestrians and cyclists when colliding with motorised vehicles. See also ERSO web text on Speeding.

Transport

Weight (mass) also plays a very prominent role in the outcome of accidents. When a heavy and a light vehicle collide, the occupants of light vehicles are far more at risk of sustaining severe injury (Broughton, 2005). This is because the energy that is released in the collision is mainly absorbed by the lighter vehicle. There are mass differences from a factor of 10 (light cars) to nearly 700 (lorries of 50 tons). In addition, pedestrians and cyclists do not have a 'steel cage' around them that can absorb some of the energy released in a collision. Laboratory tests show that in a collision between a car and a pedestrian, the survival rate of the pedestrian decreases enormously as the car speed increases. The probability of fatal injury for a pedestrian colliding with a vehicle is shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Fatality risk as a function of impact speed for pedestrians struck by the front of a passenger car.

Source Rosén et al., 2011

2.2 Walking and cycling as transport modes

Table 2 presents the average percentage of the daily time spent in traffic as a passenger in public transport, as a bicyclist and as a pedestrian in various countries. The year is the year of measurement (Cabello et al., 2010). In each country on average about one hour per day is spent on travelling.

Transport

Table 2: Percentage of the daily time spent on mobility as a passenger in public transport, as a bicyclist and as a pedestrian

Country	Year	Public Transport	Bike	Walk
Latvia	2003	32%	5%	30%
Switzerland	2005	12%	5%	45%
Nethrlands	2006	5%	25%	22%
Spain	2000	12%		35%
Sweden	2006	11%	9%	23%
Austria	2005	17%	4%	21%
Germany	2002	8%	9%	23%
Finland	2005	8%	9%	22%
Denmark	2003	8%	15%	16%
Norway	2001	10%	4%	22%
UK	2006	9%	2%	24%
France	1994	8%	3%	19%
Belgium	1999	6%	8%	16%
Ireland	2006	11%	2%	13%
Canada	2001	11%	1%	7%
Australia	2006	8%	1%	5%
USA	2001	2%	1%	9%

Source: Cabello et al., 2010

2.2.1 Walking as a transport mode

Walking as a means of transport is commonly used for short trips. However, assessing pedestrian mobility at country level can be difficult since national travel surveys do not usually register the shorter trips. Also, the walking parts of trips made primarily by public transport are typically not taken into account. At present, the importance of walking is, therefore, underestimated (Wittink, 2001).

Survey data from seven selected European countries show that 12-30% of all trips is made by walking (as the main transport mode), the highest figure being for Great Britain (OECD, 1998). For short trips under 5 km, the share of walking is higher, with a maximum of 45% in Great Britain. The average length of walking trips varies from just under 1 km (Great Britain) to 2,8 km (Finland). It should be noted, however, that the extent of coverage of short trips may vary from country to country in national travel surveys. This will affect the comparability of average trip length and the share of walking. In Great Britain, all trip lengths are included, whereas in Denmark trips shorter than 300 metres are excluded from the survey and all trips between 300 and 1.500 metres are recorded to be 1 km (OECD, 1998).

Walking is a means of travelling used mainly for two purposes: short trips to specific destinations such as shops for small items and leisure trips, where walking is in itself the main purpose (Hydén, Nilsson & Risser, 1998). About 15-30% of all person kilometres walked (on an average day) is for shopping purposes. Home-leisure trips cover about 30-55% of the person kilometres, with Switzerland at the top and Finland at the bottom (OECD, 1998). These trips are often made on local roads in familiar areas.

2.2.2 Cycling as a transport mode

In most countries, a high proportion of people own a bicycle (in Norway, for instance, 70% of adults own a bicycle, in Switzerland, 69% of households own a bicycle). The number of bicycles per 1.000 inhabitants ranges from 52 in the Czech Republic to 1.000 in the Netherlands. What

Transport

differs considerably from one country to another is the way in which the bicycle is used. Some cyclists use it every day, as a means of transport, while others do so only occasionally (ECMT, 2000).

Survey data from a selection of seven European countries show that 3-28% of all trips are made by cycling, the highest figure being for the Netherlands (OECD, 1998). For short trips under 5 km, the share of cycling varies from 12% (Finland) to 39% (the Netherlands). The average trip length for cycling is around 3 km in most European countries.

The bicycle is used for short trips to shops and for leisure purposes where the bicycle-tour probably is an aim in itself. However, cycling is also a common way for travelling to work (Hydén, Nilsson & Risser, 1998). Between about 30 and 40% of the person kilometres by bicycle is travelled on home-work trips. Home-leisure trips cover about 20-45% of the person kilometres, with the most made in Switzerland and the least in Finland (OECD, 1998).

2.2.3 Age groups most involved in walking and cycling

Some groups of traffic participants walk or cycle more than others. These differences are also reflected in their accident involvement. Age groups for which walking is particularly important, are children below the age of 12 and adults aged 75 and above. Data from the Netherlands illustrate this. People aged over 75 years make one-third of their trips on foot. They use the car slightly more often (38%), but considerably less often than younger adults aged 25 to 74 years, who use this vehicle for more than half of their trips. The bicycle is considerably less popular for elderly people: they use the bicycle for only 17% of all trips. Together with people aged between 25 and 29, they use the bicycle the least and travel the shortest distances.

The bicycle is more important in the youngest age categories. Data from the Netherlands (Table 3) show that children in the age group from 0 to 11 years travel by bicycle as often as they walk (both 29%). The same is the case for young adults aged between 18 and 24 years. Next to walking (20%) and cycling (23%), public transport (18%) is a commonly used mode of transport among these groups. For young people in secondary school (12 to 17 years of age), the bicycle is by far the most important vehicle: they use their bicycle for no less than 52% of all trips.

Data from other European countries show the same pattern: young children and older adults walk the most, whereas somewhat older children cycle the most (OECD, 1998; Hydén, Nilsson & Risser, 1998).

Table 3: Modal split by age group in the Netherlands.

	0-11	12-17	18-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-74	75+
Pedestrian	29%	18%	20%	19%	18%	17%	18%	25%	34%
Bicycle	29%	52%	23%	17%	20%	23%	22%	24%	17%
Moped/mofa	0%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Motorcycle/scooter	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Passenger car	40%	17%	37%	56%	56%	55%	54%	46%	38%
Bus	1%	5%	8%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	4%
Tram/metro	0%	1%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Train	0%	2%	6%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Other	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: Wegman & Aarts, 2005

2.3 Speed Management

Speed is the key factor in serious and fatal accidents involving pedestrians and cyclists (WHO: Speed Management. 2008). Reducing the speed of the motor vehicle involved reduces the energy of the collision, gives more time to take avoiding action and reduces the number of accidents.

Speed also affects the severity of injuries, particularly for vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists. The European Transport Safety Council (European Transport Safety Council 1995) reports that in a vehicle-pedestrian collision, the probability of pedestrian death is 5% if the vehicle is travelling at 20 mph, but increases to 45% at 30 mph, and reaches 85% at 40 mph.

As the majority of deaths and injuries to pedestrians and cyclists occur in built-up areas, one of the most successful methods of reducing speeds and collisions has been the introduction of 30km/h (20mph) Zones. In the past these have often been in quiet residential neighbourhoods, but recent developments have seen them in shopping areas and other busier roads. In some cities the majority of roads now have a 30km/h speed limit and there is a trend for cities and towns to extend these Zones, with a vision for all roads to be 30kph.

The benefits are well proven and there is a large international literature on traffic calming, including studies from Germany (Blanke 1993), Switzerland (Lindenmann 2005), Australia (Farlie and Taylor 1990), Denmark (Engel and Thomsen 1992), the Netherlands (Agustsson 2001; Vis and Dijkstra 1992), USA (Cottrell, Kim et al. 2006; Day, Anderson et al. 2007), Japan (Yamanaka, Yamaguchi et al. 1998) and Canada (Zein, Geddes et al. 1997).

Two international systematic reviews have looked at the effects of traffic calming on injuries. Elvik (2001) conducted a meta-analysis on the effects of urban-wide traffic calming schemes on personal injury collisions, including all relevant before and after studies regardless of whether the study design included a control group. He found that on average traffic calming schemes reduced road traffic collisions by 15%. Using subsets and meta-analysis for studies using matched comparison groups, Elvik found that traffic calming reduced collisions by 12%.

A study in London evaluated 78 zones in an uncontrolled before and after study design with 5 years of before data and at least 1 year of after data (average was 3 years). Though the study did not have a formal comparison group, the authors were able to adjust estimates of casualty

reductions to account for background trends on unclassified roads and found substantial casualty reductions in London's 30km/h zones, as presented in the following table (Webster & Layfield, 2007).

Table 4: Reduction in casualty frequency in 20 mph zones in London, per road user group.

Reduction in casualty frequency in 20 mph zones (adjusted) User group	All Casualties	Killed and Seriously Injured
All road users	45%	54%
Children	42%	45%
Pedestrians	36%	39%
Pedal cyclists	21%	30%
Powered 2 wheelers	58%	79%

3 Accident characteristics: where and how?

The number of fatalities among pedestrians and cyclists in Europe decreases (See the Erso Traffic Safety Basic Fact on Pedestrians and the Erso Traffic Safety Basic Fact on Cyclists). However, the decline is slower than the decline of fatalities among car occupants. Age groups that have the highest percentage of pedestrian fatalities are children younger than 14 years of age and adults aged 65 years or older. Cyclist fatalities have the highest share among children between 5 and 14 years of age and adults between 65 and 79 years. The percentages for these age groups are more or less twice as high as the average percentages for all age groups. The following sections contain information about the circumstances in which pedestrian and cyclist accidents take place and starts with some data considerations: what accidents are considered to be traffic-related, and how well are they reported in the police accident statistics.

3.1 Data considerations

3.1.1 Definition of a traffic-related accident

Not all accidents involving pedestrians and/or cyclists are considered to be traffic-related. According to the UNECE definition, road traffic accidents are those (1) which occurred or originated on a way or street open to public traffic; (2) which resulted in one or more persons being killed or injured and (3) in which at least one moving vehicle was involved.

These accidents include collisions between vehicles, between vehicles and pedestrians, and between vehicles and animals or fixed obstacles. Single vehicle accidents in which one vehicle alone (and no other road user) is involved, are also included. Multi-vehicle collisions are counted as only one accident but can refer to successive collisions happening at very short intervals. (United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, 2005).

As a result, an impact in which a pedestrian fell as a result of loose paving stones is not regarded as a road traffic accident. The same applies for an impact where the pedestrian fell while boarding or alighting from a bus.

3.1.2 Certain types of accidents are underreported

Pedestrian and cyclist accidents are heavily and disproportionally underreported in the police accident statistics compared to what hospital records and other studies show (OECD, 1998). Single-vehicle accidents, in particular, in which the 'vehicle' is a pedestrian or a bicyclist, are grossly underreported in police statistics. Pedestrian falls, even where this may be due to the poor quality of the pavement or in reaction to the action of another road user (and without impact with that other road user), is not considered to be a road accident and these are not reported in the police statistics. A comparison between medical data and police data in the Netherlands indicates that only 4% of the single-vehicle accidents in which the vehicle was a bicycle and the cyclist was seriously injured (MAIS 2 or more), are recorded by the police (Reurings & Bos, 2009), whereas it is estimated that 70% of the bicycle impacts are single-vehicle accidents (Kampen,van, 2007).

In the UK, a study of hospital admission data showed around 3 times as many cyclists admitted to hospital than were recorded in the accident statistics (STATS19) collected by the Police (UK Department for Transport https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system /uploads/attachment_data/file/358042/rrcgb2013-02.pdf.)

3.1.3 Risk and measurement of exposure

Comparing the accident risks of cyclists and pedestrians with those of car occupant can be problematic. Risk is the ratio between some measure of adverse consequences (e.g. accidents in which people are severely injured or killed) and some measure of exposure to conditions under which those consequences are possible. In the case of transport the most widely used measure of exposure is distance travelled, yet the speed at which such travel is conducted also influences risk. Since speeds for various transport modes (walking, cycling, motorised transport) are widely different, it has been suggested that exposure (vehicle kilometres travelled) should be normalised by multiplying by speed to produce a risk measure which is expressed as accidents or casualties per hour of exposure.

Table 5 shows the fatality risk of different modes of transport both in terms of the number of fatalities per distance travelled and the number of fatalities per hour travelled. In the columns with the heading 'normalised' the risks of the different modes of transport are compared with the risk of a passenger in public transport. This risk is set on 1.

Table 5: Fatality risks over distance and time for various modes of transport.

| Travel mode		10^8 person km		10^8 person hours	
		Absolute	Normalised	Absolute	Normalised
Road	Total	1,1	13,8	33	16,5
	Bus/Coach	0,08	1	2	1
	Car	0,8	10	30	15
	Foot	7,5	93,8	30	15
	Cycle	6,3	78,8	90	45
	M/C, moped	16,0	200	500	250
Trains		0,04	0,5	2	1
Ferries		0,33	4,2	10,5	5,3
Planes		0,08	1	36,5	18,3

Source: Hakkert, A.S. (2010) and based on ETSC data (1999).

Table 5 shows that when distance travelled is used as denominator, driving in a car is more than nine times safer than walking and almost eight times safer than cycling. However, when time in

traffic is used as denominator driving in a car is as safe as walking and only three times safer than cycling. Figure 3 shows the risk per age group and gender of bicyclists in the Netherlands with the number of inhabitants as denominator and Figure 4 shows this risk with the distance cycled as denominator.

Figure 3: Number of killed bicyclists per 100.000 inhabitants by gender and age group in the Netherlands (2005-2009).


Source: Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment.

The effects of the different denominators in Figure 2 and Figure 3 to calculate risk is clearly visible. Whereas Figure 2 shows that teenage bicyclists have an increased risk, Figure 3 shows that this is hardly the case. The reason is that teenagers cycle a lot in the Netherlands as most of them go to their secondary school by bicycle. In both Figure 2 and Figure 3 the accident rate of the oldest age group is high, however the accident rate of older female bicyclists is much lower than of older male bicyclists in Figure 2 and the difference is not so extreme in Figure 3. The reason is that there are more older females than older males. The main reason that older bicyclists have such a high accident rate is predominantly caused by their increasing vulnerability with age and to a lesser extend to their decreasing road user and capabilities (e.g. longer reaction times, reduced vision) and cycling capabilities (e.g. reduced muscular strength with age).

Figure 4: Number of killed bicyclist per billion kilometres cycled by gender and age group in the Netherlands (2005-2009).


Source: Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment.

A second problem that is introduced when comparing accidents among cyclists and pedestrians with those among car drivers and/or passengers relates to the roads they use. More than one third of all car kilometres are driven on highways that have been made very safe. If only those roads are considered which are also used by cyclists and pedestrians, the accident rate for car driving will be higher (Wittink, 2001).

Thirdly, less easily quantifiable measures such as the level of congestion of the roads or behavioural factors such as whether children are accompanied on their journeys also affect exposure to risk. The same applies for cycling experience. The more experienced a cyclist is, the lower his fatality rate is, and vice versa. Not only individual kilometrage matters. Accident rates are also related to the total amount of cycling in a country. In countries where people cycle a lot, cyclists in general have a lower fatality rate. A similar inverse relationship exists for the number of pedestrians or cyclists crossing at intersections. Summersgill et al. (1996) have shown that for pedestrians crossing at intersections, increasing pedestrian flows result in lower accident rates per crossing pedestrian (Wittink, 2001; PROMISING, 2001c). Jacobson (2003) noted that the larger the group of pedestrians and cyclists in a country was the lower their accident risk was and that the relationship between group size and accident risk was non-linear. This non-linear relationship is shown by the regression line in Figure 5.

Transport

Figure 5: Relationship between fatality rates and bicycle usage for European countries based on IRTAD-data


Source: Wegman et al., 2010

The non-linear relationship between the number of vulnerable road users and their accident risk is denoted as 'safety in numbers'. There is no explanation for the safety in numbers effect. Firstly, when there are more bicyclists and pedestrians, they expect certain behaviour in certain conditions by pedestrians and bicyclists and anticipate possible hazards. There may also be an effect when more car drivers are also regular cyclists.

Pedestrians and cyclists take more notice of cars in countries where they are more exposed to cars (i.e. hazard anticipation by bicyclists and pedestrians). The infrastructure (bicycle paths, pavements) is better in countries with more cyclists and pedestrians. When short trips by car are replaced by trips by bicycle, the occasions where cars can collide with bicycles decrease. That car drivers learn over time to expect bicyclists coming from unexpected directions after more exposure to a particular critical situation was shown by Phillips et al. (2011). Stipdonk and Reurings (2010) deduced from data and some hypothetical conditions that when young drivers replace short car trips by bicycle trips, the number of fatalities decline, but when older drivers do this, the number of fatalities increase.

Bearing in mind the limitations that the use of accident and fatality rates, Figure 6 gives an indication of the fatality rates for different age groups while walking, cycling, riding a motorcycle, and driving a passenger car:

Figure 6: Fatalities per billion kilometres travelled in the Netherlands; 2001-2005

Source: Dutch Ministry of Transport/Statistics Netherlands

3.2 General trends in number of fatalities

In the last decade, pedestrian fatalities have diminished by around 37% in the EU, while the total number of fatalities decreased by nearly 45%. In 2013, the proportion of fatally injured pedestrians of the total number of traffic fatalities was the lowest in the Netherlands (11%) and in Finland and Belgium (13% and 14% respectively) and the highest in Romania and Latvia (39%). The EU average is 22%. See Erso Traffic Safety Basic Fact on Pedestrians for 2015.

Bicycle fatalities make up 7,8% of the total number of road fatalities in 2013 in the EU countries. In these countries 2.017 people riding bicycles were killed in road accidents in 2013, which is 7,6% less than the 2.183 bicycle fatalities reported in 2012. In the EU the number of cyclist fatalities decreased by 32% during the decade 2004-2013. It should be noted, however, that reductions in the number of fatalities in a country cannot be evaluated without also looking at trends in mobility. Numbers of pedestrian and cyclist fatalities are affected both by the number of walkers and cyclists and the number of motorised vehicles with which they are likely to be in conflict. But mobility data on pedestrian kilometres and cyclist kilometres are only available for a few countries (see Table 6 for data for the Netherlands and the United Kingdom).

Table 6: Billion person kilometres travelled as pedestrian or cyclist

|		1981-1983*	1991-1993	2001-2003
Pedestrians	UK	27,5	26	21,3
	Netherlands	10,7	11,7	13,3
Cyclists	UK	5,0	4,8	4,4
	Netherlands	2,7	2,9	3,3

* For the Netherlands, 1985-1987 data are used
Source: SUNflower +6 (Lynam et al., 2005)

Since exposure data are available for only a few countries, the question remains whether the

Transport

reduction in fatalities were caused by a reduction in kilometrage (exposure to danger) or by an increase in safety per walking kilometre. Exposure data from Table 5, Figure 7 shows that in 2003 compared to the 1980s, the numbers of pedestrian fatalities per kilometre travelled and cyclist fatalities per kilometre travelled were reduced to about 50%.

Figure 7: Index of pedestrian fatalities and cyclist fatalities per kilometre walked and cycled respectively for the Netherlands and United Kingdom

Source: SUNflower +6 (Lynam et al., 2005)

3.3 Age groups most involved in fatal accidents

In the EU, the proportion of killed pedestrians of all road fatalities per age group is high for children, but is the highest for pedestrians for the eldest pedestrians 80 years of age and older. The pedestrian fatality rate of the elderly is well above average, and rises quickly from the age of 70 until 85 (see the already mentioned Erso Traffic Safety Basic Fact on Pedestrians, 2015). Age groups that have the highest percentage of pedestrian fatalities are children younger than 14 years of age and adults aged 65 and above. About 35 to 50% of the fatalities in these age groups were pedestrian fatalities; twice as much as the average percentage for all age. The youngest age groups, those younger than 14 years of age, also have the highest percentage of pedestrian casualties: 35-40% of the casualties in these age groups were pedestrian casualties.

Cyclist fatalities have the highest share among children between 5 and 14 years of age. About 12-20% of the fatalities in this age group were cyclist fatalities; about twice as much as the average percentage for all age groups. Adults between 65 and 79 years of age also have the highest percentage of cyclist casualties: 13-16% of the casualties in this age group were cyclist casualties.

3.3.1 Young pedestrians and Cyclists

Most accidents involving children occur in the late afternoon, when they are either walking back home or playing outside. Several British studies have shown that most of the pedestrian fatalities were connected to running or not paying attention at the time of the accident (Sentinella &

Keigan, 2005; Carole Miller Research, 1998; Tight et al., 1996). In the Netherlands, fatal accidents with children are nearly always with a motor vehicle. The impacting vehicles are typically: cars for young pedestrians, and heavy vehicles (vans and lorries) for young cyclists. Collisions between cyclists and heavy goods vehicles include the common accident scenario where the cyclist is in the blind spot of a lorry turning right (or turning left in left-hand side driving countries).

A study of children's exposure to risk as pedestrians and their rate of involvement in accidents in three European countries found a higher fatality rate among children in Britain than among children in France and the Netherlands, although children in Britain spent marginally less time in traffic as pedestrians and crossed the road less frequently than children in the other two countries (Bly et al., 1999). This study found that these exposure rates alone do not explain the increased fatality rate. It was determined that children in Britain spend more time on main roads and busy streets than children in the other two countries, that they cross roads between rather than at intersections, and that they are more likely to be accompanied by other children than by adults. These specific examples of exposure are, in turn, connected with the country 's residential and traffic infrastructure and, not least, with typical national habits such as adults accompanying children to school (OECD, 2004).

While all children are vulnerable, some children are more at risk than others. There is some evidence of a gender correlation between road safety behaviour and accident involvement. In the United Kingdom, accident patterns for pedestrians reveal a consistently higher rate of incidence for boys than for girls under age 12. In the 5-11 age group, twice as many boys are likely to be killed or severely injured than girls. In the Netherlands, 64% of the traffic victims under 14 are boys. Teenage male bicyclist fatalities exhibit a similar pattern. Teenage female pedestrians may be at particularly high risk once their exposure is taken into account (Ward, 1994), (OECD, 2004).

3.3.2 Elderly pedestrians and cyclists
An important cause of the high fatality rate of older cyclists and pedestrians is the physical vulnerability of elderly people. Since their bones are more brittle and their soft tissue less elastic, they are at higher risk of severe injury, even if the accident forces are the same. If it is assumed that cyclists of all ages have about the same speed (around 16 km/h) when they fall, the number of fatalities divided by the number seriously injured provides an indication of the vulnerability of the cyclists. The smaller the figure for a particular age group, the less vulnerable are the cyclists in this age group. In Figure 8 the rate between fatalities and seriously injured bicyclists and the rate between fatalities and seriously injured car drivers of 30-34 years of age is indexed as 1. The figure shows the vulnerability index by age group for bicyclists and car drivers in the Netherlands.

Transport

Figure 8: Vulnerability index: the number of fatalities divided by the number of seriously injured per age group for bicyclists and car occupants in the Netherlands (2007-2009) with the vulnerability of the 30-34 years old indexed as 1

Source: Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment

Figure 8 indicates that older cyclists are much more vulnerable than middle-aged cyclists and that older cyclists are much more vulnerable than older car occupants. Teenage bicyclists also have a relatively high vulnerability. This is remarkable as, in general, they are physically strong and in good health. It was assumed that when bicyclists of all ages have an accident. This is apparently not true. Figure 8 indicates that the kinetic impact of an accident is not the same for all and shows the percentages of cyclist-motor vehicle accidents of all the cycle accidents (including the single vehicle accidents) resulting in serious injury.

Figure 8: Percentage of seriously injured bicyclists per age group of the total number of seriously injured bicyclists due to a bicycle-motor vehicle accident in the Netherlands (2007-2009).

Source: Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment.

Figure 9 shows that teenage cyclists are more seriously injured due in an accident with another vehicle than middle-aged bicyclists and older bicyclists. As the kinetic impact of a accident in general will be stronger than a fall, the peak for teenage bicyclists in Figure 8 is self-evident. Figure 9 indicates that the peak in Figure 8 for young bicyclists is caused by the fact that they less often fall and more often collide with other motor vehicles than bicyclists in other age groups.

The elderly have a higher chance of being involved in an accident because people become more vulnerable when they grow older but also because locomotive functions deteriorate with increasing years. This deterioration generally consists of slower movement; a decrease of muscular tone, a decrease in fine coordination, and a particularly strong decrease in the ability to adapt to sudden changes in posture (keeping balance). This latter aspect is particularly important for cyclists and pedestrians, but also for public transport users. See ERSO web text on Older Drivers.

Older pedestrians are over-represented in accidents at intersections, particularly those without traffic signals, and being struck by a turning vehicle. Older pedestrians are also over-represented in accidents when they are crossing mid-block sections of roads, particularly on wide multi-lane roads, in busy bi-directional traffic (Oxley et al., 2004). Pedestrian accidents in which no moving vehicle is involved also occur more frequently among older pedestrians. However, these are not included in the UNECE definition of a road accident and are, therefore, heavily under-reported or not included in accident databases at all. These include falls when boarding or exiting public

Transport

transport, falls on footpaths, when stepping off kerbs, and while crossing the road (without being struck by a vehicle). Although injuries resulting from pedestrian falls and other non-collision events are generally not as severe as those where a vehicle is involved, they nevertheless represent a significant cause of trauma for older pedestrians (Oxley et al., 2004).

According to Dutch studies (Goldenbeld, 1992), when older cyclists crash with a passenger car, the cyclist often had to cross a multi-lane road. Such incidents (63% of all accidents) occurred particularly inside urban areas (50%), at intersections (19%), and at T-junctions (15%). The latter accidents most often occurred at intersections and T-junctions which were controlled by traffic signs (25%). The difficulties experienced by older cyclists related primarily to manoeuvres such as crossing or turning against the traffic at the intersection. In the majority of these cases, the passenger car was driving on a main road while the cyclist approached from a side road. This accident type resembles the accident type that is over-represented among older car drivers: while turning, the older driver collides with oncoming traffic with right of way on the main road (see ERSO Older Drivers web text). Negotiating an intersection clearly represents a "testing of the limits" type of task; it requires a host of age-sensitive functions while simultaneously limiting the usefulness of normal safe driving strategies such as anticipating upcoming events.

3.4 Collision partners

The more severe the consequences of a traffic accident, the more that the accident will be a collision between a motor vehicle and a pedestrian or cyclist. Table 7 shows the average annual number of fatally, seriously and slightly injured pedestrians per million inhabitants in the Netherlands as a result of a collision with another road user and as a result of a fall not involving other road users.

Table 7: Average number of victims over the years 2003-2007 per million inhabitants in the Netherlands.

	Deaths	Serious injury	Minor injury	Total
Pedestrians	9,2	319	3.050	3.375
Involving no other road users	2,8	245	2.815	3.070
Involving other road users	6,4	74	235	305
Bicyclists	13,5	466	3.695	4.170
Involving no other road users	3,1	368	2.915	3.280
Involving other road users	10,4	98	780	890
Other means of transport	36,5	503	2.950	3.495
Total	59,2	1.288	9.695	11.040

Source: Methorst (2010)

3.5 Road types

Most injuries (all severities) to pedestrians and cyclists occur in urban areas. However, in rural areas, the percentage of fatalities is higher than the percentage of slight injuries (OECD, 1998). This means that accident severity is higher in rural areas. Higher vehicle speeds in such areas is a key factor but factors include: the absence of pedestrian facilities e.g. footpaths, a more acute visibility problem, the increased negative effects of drink driving etc. (ECMT, 2000). Although this general tendency is observed (i.e., most casualties occurring in urban areas), in France and Spain

Transport

there are more fatalities of cyclists in rural areas than in urban areas. In addition, in Spain more pedestrian fatalities occur in rural areas than in urban areas (OECD, 1998).

3.6 Crossing facilities

Accidents involving pedestrians and cyclists occur frequently at facilities designed for pedestrians and cyclists such as pedestrian crossings, cycle tracks, and cycle lanes. This means that these facilities are not necessarily safe enough to prevent accidents (OECD, 1998). However, pedestrian crossings probably also are those locations at which roads are most often crossed.

In the United Kingdom, over 20% of accidents happen at places where people should be safe, such as on the pavement or at a pedestrian crossing. In Denmark, half of the accidents with cyclists occur at facilities for cyclists such as cycle tracks or cycle lanes (OECD, 1998).

Pedestrian accidents occur most often whilst crossing the roadway, especially for older pedestrians. In the Netherlands, 25% of the pedestrians who died as a result of an accident while crossing the road, were crossing at a zebra or other kinds of pedestrian crossing. Among the elderly, 75% of pedestrians who died as a result of an accident did so whilst crossing the road. Of these, 38% were crossing the road at a pedestrian crossing.

Pedestrian accidents often occur when people are trying to cross the street on links off pedestrian crossings, i.e. where no pedestrian crossings exist. One of the causes is the driver's difficulty in perceiving pedestrians because of darkness and/or parked cars. In the United Kingdom, nearly 90% of the injury accidents with older pedestrians which are caused by motor vehicles happen under such conditions. In over 10% of the cases the drivers cannot see pedestrians because of parked cars. 67% of pedestrians in the United Kingdom were killed or injured whilst crossing the road more than 50 metres away from a pedestrian crossing (OECD, 1998).

3.7 Contributory factors

There are various causes why motor vehicles collide with pedestrians and cyclists. Drivers may drive too fast and may not notice pedestrians and cyclists. It could also be that drivers do not expect pedestrians and cyclists from certain directions (Summala et al., 1996) or do not expect that in certain circumstances pedestrians and bicyclists may start to act dangerously (e.g. a pedestrian who suddenly may cross the road, because he wants to catch his bus that has stopped on the other side of the road). It could also be that drivers have adequate hazard perception skills, but underestimate the risks and/or overestimate their own capabilities to avert an accident. Not only drivers, but also pedestrians and bicyclists may lack hazard perception skills and/or take too much risk. Lack of hazard perception skills (both by drivers and pedestrians and bicyclists) and the tendency to take too much risk (both by drivers and pedestrians and bicyclists) is influenced by factors such as experience, age, training and gender. There are also temporally factors such as the influence of psychoactive substances (alcohol, illicit drugs and medicines), fatigue, inattention/distraction and emotions.

Drivers may not notice pedestrians and bicyclist because they are poorly visible. This is aggravated at dusk, dawn, and night, especially when public lighting is absent or weak. The most

Transport

serious problem for cyclists seems to be detection of them by drivers approaching alongside or from behind. The limited physical visibility of cyclists (linked to their vehicle – car drivers are seeking for vehicles as big as theirs) is reinforced, at least in countries when cycling is not very common, by their lack of 'social visibility': car drivers do not see cyclists because they do not expect to see any (PROMISING, 2001b).

The influence of technical defects of the bicycle, the quality of the road surface, and the presence of protective devices (such as cycle seats and wheel spoke covers) has been analysed in the Netherlands. A technical cycle defect was cited as the principal cause of the accident by 7% of cyclists aged twelve years and older. In most cases, the condition of the brakes was poor (Schoon, 1996).

The increase of accident risk with the amount of alcohol consumed is about the same for drivers and bicyclists, but increases steeper for pedestrians (Olkkonen & Honkanen, 1990).

3.8 Attitudes and Behaviours

The relationship between drivers and cyclists is an important factor in helping to explain the collisions. Where there is animosity, then driving and riding behaviours can increase the risk and severity. Alternatively, if the drivers are also regular cyclists, then they have a better understanding of the potential risks and behave with more consideration.

A study in the UK (Basford 2002) investigated driver's perceptions of cyclists and identified problems of animosity which were at the core of poor and dangerous driver behaviour. This study formed the basis of a campaign in London that asked road users to 'share the road'. It identified some of the major behavioural problems (such as cyclists not stopping at red traffic signals and drivers moving into the cyclist advanced stop line area at signals) and stressed the need for all road users to share the road safely (https://tfl.gov.uk/campaign/share-the-road).

Child deaths on the road are particularly tragic and often the most difficult situations to treat. While the research is weak, there is a belief among many road safety professionals that education and training can contribute significantly to safer roads. One of the best researched campaigns is the "Children's Traffic Club" which has proven to provide long term benefits compared to control groups. This initiative includes education on safe walking and cycling and aims to provide sound road safety understanding when children are at a receptive age.

Children's Traffic Club was one of a package of measures introduced to educate children from 2 to 16 years old, and children killed and seriously injured have fallen from 614 in 2002 to 187 in 2013, a 70% reduction.

Another specific road safety issue can be cyclists killed and injured by lorries in cities. It is often difficult for lorry drivers to see cyclists, even with a number of mirrors as fitted to modern lorries. Driver training is needed to ensure drivers are aware of the dangers. The situation can also be made worse by cyclists who often cycle down the side of lorries, who then turn right (or left), with tragic results. Campaigns and warning signs on the back of lorries can help to reduce these collisions.

There has also been a problem in London with lorries that are exempt from the design regulations that require side protection (under-run) bars between the wheel of trailers. These include cement and tipper lorries that are often used in building works. These types of exempt lorries are three times as likely to be involved in cycle fatalities than standard designs.

4 Measures to reduce accident numbers and injury severity

Long-term planning is needed to create the fundamental changes that will improve the safety and mobility of vulnerable road users. Measures require a framework that takes the various needs of vulnerable road users into account. Concepts like Sustainably Safe Traffic and Zero Vision provide the framework that long-term planning requires. These concepts stop defining road fatalities as a negative but largely accepted side-effect of the road transport system. Rather, road fatalities can and should be avoided, and the probability of accidents can be reduced drastically by means of the infrastructure design. Where accidents still do occur, the process which determines the severity of these accidents should be influenced in such a manner that the possibility of severe injury is virtually eliminated.

The Dutch Sustainably Safe Traffic system is currently characterised by:
- A structure that is adapted to the limitations of human capacity through proper design, and in which streets and roads have a neatly appointed function, as a result of which improper use is prevented.
- Vehicles which are fitted with facilities to simplify the driver's tasks and which are designed to protect the vulnerable human being as effectively as possible.
- Road users, who are adequately educated, informed and, where necessary, guided and restricted.

A road safety system based on this framework can be combined with transport policies that honestly consider walking and cycling as a mode of transport, such as the one written down in UK's White Paper on A new Deal for transport: better for everyone (Wittink, 2001).

The main consequences of the necessary framework and new concepts for road planning and design are:
- Motorised traffic with a flow or distribution function must be segregated from non-motorised transport.
- A network of main traffic routes must be created for pedestrians and cyclists.
- A fair balance between motorised and non-motorised traffic for priority facilities at crossings should be achieved.
- The maximum speed of motorised traffic should be limited on roads where it mixes with non-motorised traffic (Wittink, 2001).

A clear vision then needs a road safety strategy and action plans to deliver the required changes. Research has shown the importance of developing a road safety strategy which uses a multi-disciplinary approach to improving road safety. It needs to be based on a high quality analysis of reliable and comprehensive accident information, which considers all the factors which have led to the accidents. Having gained a comprehensive understanding of the accident situation, all stakeholders then need to identify objectives and agree the best way to treat these problems. A

Transport

strategy that identifies the best way to apply resources to achieve the objectives needs to be developed (ETSC, 2006). A cost-benefit approach can be relevant, when data are available.

It is vital that all potential stakeholders are identified and included in the development of the strategy; aligning all stakeholders and getting commitment is vital to achieving success. Research has shown that accidents are reduced more when a mixture of measures are used, rather than a single measure. This application of packages of measures involving a variety of stakeholders is very important.

The specific measures that are needed to realize a safe traffic system include road and traffic planning, strong legal frameworks, strong enforcement, good road design and good education and training. In addition, there are other measures that could improve the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, such as the improvement of their visibility; pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly design of cars and heavy vehicles and bicycle helmets.

4.1 Land use planning

Historically, our towns and cities have been designed and constructed to allow vehicular access and encourage mobility. Initially it was the horse and cart, then the omnibus, the 'horseless carriage' and the finally rise of the motor car. The legacy is all around us with wide fast roads common in many of our cities.

In more recent times, however, there has been a shift back from motorised vehicles to the vulnerable road users – pedestrians and cyclists – who are at last becoming a priority in the transport system. The road network legacy, designed primarily for motor vehicles, is not always sympathetic with the needs of pedestrians and cyclists and this can create road safety problems.

Pedestrian safety measures that are the most comprehensive and most closely associated with urban planning and policy philosophies are:
* Area-wide speed reduction or traffic calming schemes, and
* Provision of an integrated walking network.

These are two complementary measures, which can be implemented together without conflicting. Not only do they apply to different parts of the urban fabric, but they also address different objectives. Area-wide schemes (the most widespread of which is the 30 km/h zone) are aimed at reducing vehicle speeds and thus at allowing for a safer mingling of pedestrians with motor traffic. Integrated walking networks (usually centred around a downtown pedestrian zone) serve to remove and/or reduce conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles and to provide or improve crossing points (Wittink, 2001; PROMISING, 2001a).

The same basic planning principles that apply for pedestrians apply for cyclists. Because cycling is suitable for travelling over greater distances than walking, it is necessary to distinguish a flow and an access function. As is the case with motorised traffic, a network for the flow function is required. However, this network cannot follow the network for through-motor traffic easily, since the mesh of the routes of the cycling network is smaller. Provisions for cycling should therefore not simply be seen as additional features of the traffic structure for motor traffic. Rather, they require a network of their own (Wittink, 2001; PROMISING, 2001b).

When facilities for cyclists are being designed, five criteria are important if their needs are to be met (CROW, 2007):

Safety: for large parts of the population in Europe (the perception of) road safety problems is a key reason for not cycling. Improvement of the safety of cyclists on the road is therefore a precondition for promotion of cycling.

Coherence: continuity, consistency of quality, recognisability and completeness. It is obvious that cycling will be restricted if the cycle network is not complete or coherent. These are mainly features at network level.

Directness: mean travel time, detours and delays should be avoided.

Comfort: smoothness of road surface, curves, gradients, number of stops between starting point and destination, complexity of rider's task.

Attractiveness: visual quality of the road, variety of environment and social safety.

4.2 Road design

Road design measures that assure a pedestrian-friendly and cyclist-friendly infrastructure, relate to: area-wide speed reduction, safe walking routes, cycling networks and crossing facilities. The next four sections give a general overview of what they entail. More detailed information can be found in the ADONIS-manual (Dijkstra, 1998) and in Design manual for bicycle traffic (CROW, 2007).

4.2.1 Pedestrian-friendly networks: area-wide speed reduction and safe walking routes

Area-wide speed reduction

At collision speeds below 30 km/h, encounters between motorised vehicles and pedestrians do not usually result in a fatality. A Safe System principle is that: where pedestrians and motorised vehicles meet, driving speeds of the latter must be reduced to 30 km/h. See ERSO Speeding web text).

Area-wide reduction of driving speed in the short-term will be provided by traffic engineering and infrastructural measures. Creating zones by road signs alone does not discourage drivers from driving faster than 30 km/h. Physical measures such as speed humps can force speed reduction (Schoon, 2004), but can meet with opposition from bus and emergency vehicle drivers as well as from residents if extensive ground vibrations occur. In several countries, 30 km/h zones are implemented in residential areas or school zones. A Dutch evaluation of the effectiveness of these zones indicated that the introduction of these zones led to a reduction of about 10% in the number of fatalities per km road length and a reduction of 60% in the number of in-patients per km road length (Wegman et al., 2005).

In the medium term, intelligent use of area-wide speed cameras might provide an alternative means of enforcement in some areas. In the longer term, extensive implementation of Intelligent Speed Adaptation should result in more direct compliance with speed limits.

Safe walking routes

'Kid routes' are special corridors of safe routes for guiding children for example to schools, play areas and sport facilities. These kid routes can mainly be found in busy residential areas. Since 2006 Delft and Amsterdam are the first municipalities in the Netherlands where children can

use kid routes. The special child-friendly routes have a playful layout in which recognizable markings and boards lead children to their destination (Jager, de, et al., 2005).

4.2.2 Cycling networks

Although cycle lanes have been found to be effective safety measures on road sections – provided the width of the track is sufficient and measures have been taken to prevent accidents with vehicles parking – there is evidence that they tend to create safety problems at intersections. Particular attention has to be given to the design of cycle routes at these locations. Crossings between cycle tracks and streets do not always seem well understood by drivers, in particular, when environmental features do not clearly reflect the right-of-way, thus creating confusion among drivers and cyclists alike (PROMISING, 2001b). Additional facilities are necessary at intersections in order to reduce the speed differences between cyclists and other traffic as much as possible. Priority regulations, speed humps, and raised intersections are suitable to achieve this (SWOV, 2004).

4.2.3 Crossing facilities

The introduction of crossing facilities does not necessarily reduce pedestrian and cyclist casualties. They need to be carefully designed and appropriately sited if they are to improve safety. Crossings at inappropriate sites can lead to confusion and unsafe behaviour by both motorists and pedestrians (Lynam et al., 2005; Wittink, 2001).

Feelings of mutual respect can be promoted by right-of-way regulations, speed reduction measures and improved visibility. Examples of speed reduction measures at cyclist crossings are raised cycle crossings, humps, refuges in crossings, and mini roundabouts. Important features for improvement of visibility are: truncated cycle tracks, advanced stop lines at signalised intersections, and parking regulations (Wittink, 2001).

Features of safer pedestrian crossings, in particular to allow for the specific limitations of many elderly pedestrians, include:
- reducing the distance to be crossed by means of a median island and/or by sidewalk extensions;
- equipping more pedestrian crossings with traffic lights;
- allowing for the slower walking speed of the elderly when setting the traffic lights cycle;
- reducing the speed of other traffic or banishing motorised vehicles completely in areas with many pedestrians (SWOV, 2006a).

At facilities used by both pedestrians and cyclists there must be one rule: either both have priority, neither have priority, or both have traffic lights. Where they have priority, this can be indicated by triangular priority marking just in front of the crossing facility, combined with an extended speed hump to ensure a low approaching speed. An extended-length speed hump would increase motorists' comfort because they can position the whole vehicle on the speed hump just in front of the crossing facility (SWOV, 2005).

Combining crossing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists can be effective since a greater number of people crossing at one time reduces risk. One method is the 'Toucan crossing' currently used in Britain (Ryley, Halliday & Emmerson, 1998) (see Figure10). This crossing facility is named Toucan because both pedestrians and cyclists can use the same facility ('two can cross'). The

advantage of a combined crossing is that it is more visible for fast-moving traffic travelling on the major road. In addition, Toucans can detect the numbers of crossing pedestrians and cyclists. These systems enable a fairer distribution of waiting times for fast and slow traffic, and they often establish shorter waiting cycles.

Figure 10 Toucan crossing.

Source: C. Ford

4.3 Visibility: lighting and reflecting devices

Both child pedestrians and cyclists benefit from conspicuity aids and the use of light- coloured and retro-reflective clothing. Designers and manufacturers of children's clothing and accessories are well-positioned to incorporate retro-reflective materials into product lines. Parents, as well as public health and safety officials should encourage them to do so, as one component of an ongoing campaign for protecting children in traffic. Dangle tags, armbands, strips on school bags, and use of bicycle lamps are all recommended (OECD, 2004; OECD, 1998).

To ensure the visibility of cyclists, a bicycle should be equipped with a red reflecting device at the rear, devices ensuring that the bicycle can show white or selective yellow light in front, and red lights on the rear. In some countries, reflectors are also compulsory on the wheels, at the front, and on the pedal. However, not all bicycles meet those legal norms. A Dutch survey showed that 37% of cyclists did not have their lights on during darkness (AVV, 2005). Similar results were found in a Scandinavian survey: 35% of the cyclists did not have correct lighting (Hansen, 1995).

4.4 Vehicle design of accident opponents

Injuries to cyclists and pedestrians can be reduced by better design of cars and heavy vehicles. Design measures include crash-friendly car fronts, and side-under-run protection on lorries (Wittink, 2001).

For pedestrians and cyclists, the provision of safer car fronts for pedestrians is now required by EU legislation and is addressed in consumer safety rating. See ERSO Vehicle Safety web text and Euro NCAP (www.euroncap.com). While Euro NCAP testing is state of the art, the legislative test

Transport

requirements are not as comprehensive (ETSC, 2003), and they do not take sufficient account of cyclists who strike the car front in different places from pedestrians.

Lorries could be made much safer for third parties by the application of adequate protection around the vehicle. Such protection prevents the dangerous underrun of, for instance, cyclists and other two-wheeled vehicles. In 35-50% of the accidents between heavy goods vehicles and two-wheelers, injury severity can be limited by side-underrun protection. Moreover, this facility prevents a road user involved in a collision from being run over, in addition. The number of traffic fatalities in urban areas due to accidents of this type could be reduced by 10% (Goudswaard & Janssen, 1990). For moped riders, cyclists and pedestrians, closed side-underrun protection on lorries is more effective than open protection. Both open and closed side-underrun protection appear in the top ten of relevant and cost-effective measures to reduce the number of casualties as a result of accidents involving lorries (Kampen, van & Schoon, 1999), (see PROMISING , 2001c) for a cost-benefit analysis).

4.5 Protective devices: helmets

In the Netherlands cycling is very popular, but apart from racing cyclists and children, only a few bicyclists wear a helmet. Of the cyclists admitted to hospital following an accident with motorized traffic, approximately one third in the Netherlands has head and brain injuries. Of the single bicycle accidents (the falls not involving other road users), about a quarter has head or brain injuries (Ormel, 2009). In Europe the use of bicycle helmets is currently mandatory in Finland for all cycle use, Spain (outside built-up areas), the Czech Republic (children < 16 years), Iceland (children < 15 years), and Sweden (children < 15 years). Outside Europe, wearing bicycle helmets is compulsory in Australia, New Zealand, in twenty states of the USA, and in a number of Canadian provinces. For these countries the legislation usually applies to children and young people. The use of helmets is currently being promoted in a number of other (European) countries.

A good indication of the (maximum) effect of a bicycle helmet can be gained from case-control studies. Here the injuries of cycling casualties with and without helmets are compared, including correcting for differences in other characteristics of the cyclists (such as gender and age), and the accident circumstances. Table 8 shows the results of a recent meta-analysis of case-control studies (Elvik, 2011). This meta-analysis is a re-analysis of an earlier meta-analysis (Attewell et al., 2001) in which is adjusted for the effect of publication bias and includes more studies than in the original meta-analysis.

Table 8: Overview of the results of a meta-analysis about the effects of bicycle helmet use on reduction/increase of injuries.

Type of Injury	Number of estimates	95% confidence interval of the effect	Best estimate of the reduction in injuries
Head injury	23	-55% to – 25%	-42%
Brain injury	9	-71% to -25%	-53%**
Facial injury	13	-33% to + 3%	-17%
Neck injury	4	+1% to +72%	+32%*
Head, facial or neck injury	40	-26% to -2%	-15%
Too few estimates (4) to allow for correction on publication bias			
** Values derived from table 1 in Elvik (2011), the other values are from table 2.			

Source: Elvik (2011)

Transport

According to Table 8, wearing a bicycle helmet would then result in a reduction of the risk of receiving a head injury with around 42% and with around 53% sustaining brain injury. However, wearing a helmet increases the risk of a neck injury by around 32%. Of all the injury types taken together, current designs of cycling helmets reduce the risk of getting injured on head, brain or neck injury by 15%.

A study resembling a case-control study was carried out in Norway (mentioned in Erke & Elvik, 2007). The voluntary use of helmets is relatively high in Norway. In 2006, 63% of children up to the age of 12, 25% of young people aged 12 to 17, and 34% of adults wore helmets. An analysis showed that the risk of sustaining fatal or severe injury is reduced by 25% when a helmet is worn.

That helmets prevent head injury in general does not imply that mandatory wearing of bicycle helmets for all cyclists is necessarily an effective public health measure. Normal bicycle helmets (helmets that comply with the European standard EN-1078) offer too little protection in bicycle-motor vehicle accidents when cars hit the bicyclist at higher speeds. The car drivers can adapt their behaviour when they see a bicyclist with a helmet and the bicyclists adapt their behaviour when they wear a helmet. Car drivers pass bicyclists at a closer distance when they wear a helmet than when they do not wear a helmet (Walker, 2007). Bicyclists ride faster when they wear a helmet than when they do not wear a helmet (Philips et al., 2011). As helmets are considered as inconvenient, less people cycle when they have to wear a helmet. In some studies a strong decline in bicycle use after the introduction of mandatory helmet use is reported and in others it is not. Robinson (2006) refers to the data of large-scale counts in Australia (Melbourne and New South Wales), which show an unmistakable decline in the use of bicycles after the introduction of compulsory helmet use. This applied particularly to children and young people. In the first year after the use of helmets was made compulsory, 42% fewer children and young people were using their bicycles, and 36% less in the second year compared to before compulsory helmet use. Amongst adults there was a decline of 29% and 5% respectively. Robinson also reports a decline in the use of bicycles in the Canadian province of Nova Scotia after the introduction of compulsory bicycle helmet use, but adds that it was not easy to compare the research methods applied before and after the introduction of compulsory helmet use. On the other hand, Macpherson et al. (2001) found that in the Canadian province of Ontario, the use of bicycles by children aged 5 to 14 was not affected as a result of compulsory helmet use. The long-term effects are unknown.

All things considered, bicycle helmets are an effective means of protecting cyclists against head and brain injury, but consideration of mandatory helmet use for all age groups need to take into account other effects in weighing up the potential positive and negative effects of mandating helmet use.

A recent study undertaken by TRL for the UK Department of Transport (Hynd et al., 2009) provided a comprehensive review of the effectiveness of cycle helmets in the event of an on-road accident. The study evaluated the effectiveness of cycle helmets from several perspectives, including an assessment of the casualties who could be prevented if cycle helmets were more widely used. The report focused on understanding whether cycle helmets reduce the frequency and severity of injury in the event of a collision.

The study concluded that in the event of an on-road accident, cycle helmets would be expected to be effective in a range of real-world accident conditions, particularly the most common accidents that do not involve a collision with another vehicle and are often believed to consist of simple falls or tumbles over the handlebars.

The World Health Organisation has produced a manual for cycle helmets (WHO, 2006), which provides advice on how to increase the use of helmets within a country. The manual is aimed at policy-makers and road safety practitioners and draws on experience from countries that have succeeded in achieving and sustaining high levels of helmet use. It provides the necessary evidence that will be needed to start a helmet use programme, and takes the user through the steps needed to assess the helmet situation in a country. It then explains the steps needed to design and implement a helmet use programme, including: setting up a working group; developing an action plan; introducing and enforcing mandatory helmet laws; creating appropriate standards for helmet production; effectively marketing helmets to the public; educating children and young people on helmet use; and consideration of the capacity for an appropriate medical response to be provided following an accident. Finally, the last section in the manual guides the user on planning and implementing an evaluation of the programme, such that results are fed back into programme design. For each of these activities, the document outlines in a practical way the various steps that need to be taken.

4.6 Education and training

While infrastructure construction does provide safety benefits for cyclists, this can be a huge and expensive task in many cities. The engineering works are disruptive, expensive and it can take decades to treat a large city area. While cycle infrastructure improvement is necessary, it needs to be supported by education and campaigns that can provide a more immediate benefit.

One of the most cost-effective ways is to raise the profile of cycle accidents with the public and increase awareness of the dangers. Getting the media to report cycle deaths and getting regular coverage in the media does make cyclists and drivers more aware of the potential for accidents and will help to encourage safer behaviours. The 'theory of planned behaviour' (Fishbein 1975) identifies a concept of 'social norms' which can be modified by campaigns. One example is drink driving, which used to be common but is now seen as anti-social and not acceptable. The aim should be to make cycle deaths not acceptable and to shift the 'social norm' so that cycle deaths are offensive to society. This can be achieved by campaigns that stress the avoidability of cycle deaths and highlight the pain and suffering of families. These campaigns need to be designed locally by experienced experts.

Education supports a comprehensive approach to road safety and mobility. Crucial factors for safe behaviour are (Wittink, 2001):
- Control of the vehicle through handling skills and defensive behaviour,
- Control of situations through understanding of road conditions
- Understanding and communication among road users, and
- Behavioural patterns.

Some examples are described concerning road safety education for children. Education should, however, also be directed at other types of road users, such as motorists.

Transport

4.6.1 Road safety education for children

Young child pedestrians learn best at the roadside or a close approximation. From there, with experience, they develop conceptual understanding. This supports the promotion of practical skills training for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers in connection with reflections on emerging ideas and understanding. In addition to skills acquisition, improvement of knowledge and attitudes is implicit in most of the recently developed behavioural programmes (OECD, 2004).

There is general consensus in the research and among practitioners that ad hoc activities, such as visits from experts and road safety enthusiasts, may have mass appeal but are relatively unsuccessful. Road safety education needs to be planned and progressive. Bailey (1995) promotes integrated road safety education that spans several curriculum areas and this approach is also supported by the Good Practice Guidelines for Road Safety Education in Schools (www.dft.gov.uk) which identify and provide examples of road safety education across the curriculum and recommend that road safety professionals support teachers in delivering a progressive programme of road safety education rather than occasional talks on road safety (OECD, 2004).

Duperrrex, Bunn and Roberts (2002) reviewed the literature on the education of pedestrians for injury prevention. They identified 15 studies of sufficient quality (i.e. random assignment to the treatment group, and the use of a control group). Of these studies, 14 were aimed at children. None of the studies looked at the effect of safety education on the occurrence of pedestrian injury, but six assessed its effect on behaviour. The effects varied considerably across studies and outcomes, indicating that impact of programmes differ. Evaluation studies may encourage programme developers to enhance the effectiveness of programmes aimed at improving behaviour.

4.6.2 Education for other road users

Pedestrian and cyclists need to learn by formal and informal education how to walk and cycle safely. Other road users such as car drivers, have to learn how they can safely interact with pedestrians and bicyclists. One way of doing this is to incorporate hazard anticipation training with the emphasis on vulnerable road users in basic driver training and to include a hazard anticipation test in the driving test (Vlakveld, 2011).

4.7 Legal Framework and Enforcement

Laws and penalties are important in proving protection for vulnerable road users and influencing driver bahaviour. It is also an indicator of Government commitment to road safety and shows the balance the Government takes between road safety and mobility & freedom. Laws that are relevant to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists include speeding and dangerous driving. Far more people die on the roads than are murdered or die by manslaughter, but the penalties are nothing like the same. Often road victim groups lobby the Government on these issues and a good road safety strategy would include working with such groups.

Laws are only as good as the enforcement process and the Police are a major and important stakeholder in any road safety programme. When good enforcement is practiced it is important to get the maximum publicity so the public know that there is a risk of being apprehended for illegal and unsafe behaviour.

Transport

5   Promoting walking and cycling: changes to expect

Walking and cycling is good for the environment, is good for one's health and is cheap. It reduces congestion on the roads and is noise-free. However, walking and cycling are not safe means of transport (see Table 3). Improving pedestrian safety is key to achieving a Safe System and reducing serious health loss in through road use by child and older users in particular. Although the effects on health and environment seem to outweigh the costs related to accidents involving bicyclists (Kempen, van et al., 2010), it is also important to improve cycling safety as much as possible.

5.1   Effects on accident rates

Replacing short car trips – around 10% of all car trips is shorter than 1km – by walking or cycling should also be beneficial from a safety point of view for all age groups. This is not the case at this moment. When in the Netherlands, young road users replace short car trips by cycling trips this will result in fewer victims. However, when older road users replace short car trips by cycling trips this will result in more victims (Stipdonk & Reurings, 2010).

5.2   Effects on health

The beneficial effects of cycling on health have been assessed in terms of prevention of cardiovascular risk. In a study of 9.400 men in sedentary occupations (executive grade civil servants), 70% cycled at least one hour a week to work or did at least 25 miles of other cycling a week. They were found to have an incidence of coronary heart disease of 2,5 per 1.000 man years. This compares with 5.6 for non-cycling civil servants. Those cycling less kilometres had a rate of 4,5 (Morris 1990 in Edwards, 1998). This health aspect is 5 to 10 times more important than the safety aspect. ECF (1998) cites Hillman (1993), who calculated that years of life gained by cycling outweigh years of life lost in accidents by 20 to 1 (PROMISING, 2001b).

5.3   Environmental effects

Motorised forms of transport cause pollution through noise and exhaust emissions. Cycling and walking do not produce such emissions. The table below gives some estimated effects of replacing car kilometres with cycle kilometres.

Estimated effects of a one-third reduction in the number of car trips from 44% to 30% of all trips in a city:
- 30% less traffic jams,
- 25% reduction in pollution from motor vehicles (all types),
- 36% reduction in carbon monoxide (CO) emissions,
- 37% reduction in hydrocarbon emissions (CH) by private cars only,
- 56% reduction in nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) emission,
- 25% reduction in petrol consumption (cars only),
- 9% reduction in the number of people suffering from noise pollution,
- 42% reduction of the barrier effect of major highways.

Source: The above figures are estimations in the 1980s of the effects of a pro-bicycle policy in Graz, Austria (252,000 inhabitants; cited by EC DGXI, 1999).

A Cyclists' Public Affairs Group study (Edwards, 1998) has demonstrated that modest increases in cycling could readily reduce transport sector emissions by 6% of the total in Great Britain, while at Dutch levels there would be a 20% reduction.

Car traffic is moreover the major source of noise in towns. In France, since 1 January 1998 any renovation or construction of urban thoroughfares must include provision for cyclists. In addition, all conglomerations in France with more than 100.000 inhabitants had to adopt an urban mobility plan. The purpose of this is to reduce pollution-producing town traffic (PROMISING, 2001B).

Energy savings would also be an important benefit of increased level of cycling. The space consumption of a cyclist was calculated to be only 8% of the space consumption of a car (UPI report Heidelberg 1989, cited by EC DGXI, 1999).

5.4 Cost-benefit analysis of mode switching

Cycling does not impose the same external costs on society as car driving does. The major external costs of car driving include: air pollution, traffic noise, traffic congestion, and injury accidents.

The major external costs of cycling are the costs of injuries. However, contrary to car driving, cycling may also generate benefits for society. These may include, for example, savings in public health care as a result of improved physical fitness.

In the PROMISING project (PROMISING, 2001c), a cost-benefit analysis was carried out of switching from driving a private car to cycling. External costs that were included in the calculation were air pollution, traffic noise, 40% of the costs of accidents, and savings from reduced absence from work. The researchers concluded that despite the fact that accident costs of cycling are higher than those of car driving, the total social costs of cycling are lower than those of driving a car.

Transport

References

Aarts, L. & Schagen, I. van (2006) Driving speed and the risk of road crashes: a review. Accident Analysis and Prevention, 2, 215-224.

Agustsson, L. (2001). "Danish Experiences With Speed Zones/Variable Speed Limits." Proceedings of the Conference Traffic Safety on Three Continents: International Conference in Moscow, Russia, 19-21 September, 2001 (Vti Konferens) (18a): 761-71.

Attewell, R.G., Glase, K. & McFadden, M. (2001) Bicycle helmet efficacy: a meta-analysis. Accident Analysis and Prevention, 33(3), pp. 345-352.

AVV (2005) Road safety in The Netherlands: key figures edition 2005. AVV Transport Research Centre, Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management, Rotterdam.

Blanke, H. (1993). "Effects of traffic calming measures on speed and traffic safety (in German)." Educational Publications Of The Chair for the course For Traffic Research I [Schriftenreihe Des Lehrstuhls Fuer Verkehrswesen I] 11335s.

Bly, P., Dix, M. & Stephenson, C. (1999) Comparative study of European child pedestrian exposure and accidents. MVA Ltd., London.

Broughton, J. (2005) Car Occupant and Motorcyclists Deaths 1994-2002. TRL Report TRL629. Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne.

Broughton, J., Amoros, E., Bos, N., Evengenikos, P., Holló, P., Pérez, C. Tecl,J. (2008) Estimating the real number of road accident casualties. Deliverable 1.15 – Final report on Task 1.5 of the SafetyNet Integrated Project. Available at: http://www.dacota-project.eu/Links/erso/safetynet/fixed/WP1/D1.15_Estimation_real_number_of_road_accident_casualties_final%20report_3.pdf.

Cabello, E., Sanchez, F., Martin, I., Cabello, A.B., De Goede, M., Van der Horst, R., Conde, C. & Romay, P. (2010) Pedestrian safety data. In: Cost 358 Pedestrians' Quality Needs, Final Report – Part B: Documentation. Available at: http://www.walkeurope.org/final_report/default.asp.

Carole Miller Research (1998) The older child pedestrian casualty. Central research unit, Edinburgh.

Cottrell, W. D., N. Kim, N., Martin, P., Perrin, H.J.et al. (2006). "Effectiveness of traffic management in Salt Lake City, Utah." Journal of Safety Research 37(1): 27-41.

CROW (2007) Design manual for bicycle traffic. Record No. 25. Centre for Research and Contract Standardization in Civil and Traffic Engineering C.R.O.W, Ede.

Day, K., C. Anderson, C., Powe, M., McMillan, T., Winn, D. et al. (2007). "Remaking Minnie Street: The Impacts of Urban Revitalization on Crime and Pedestrian Safety." Journal of Planning Education and Research 26(3): 315-331.

De la Beaumelle, V, Papadimitriou, E. & Granié, M.A. (2010) Pedestrian safety data. In: Cost 358 Pedestrians' Quality Needs, Final Report – Part B: Documentation. Available at: http://www.walkeurope.org/final_report/default.asp.

Dijkstra, A. et al. (1998) Best practice to promote cycling and walking: Analysis and Development Of New Insight into Substitution of Short Car Trips ADONIS. Danish Road Directorate DRD, Copenhagen.

Duperrex, O., Bunn, F., & Roberts, I. (2002) Safety education of pedestrians for injury prevention: a systematic review of randomised controlled trials. British Medical Journal, 324, pp. 1129-1133.

EC DGXI (1999) Cycling: the way ahead for towns and cities. Directorate General XI, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.

ECF (1998) Improving bicycle safety without making helmet-use compulsory. European Cyclists' Federation, Brussels, Belgium.

ECMT (2000) Safety in road traffic for vulnerable users Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development OECD, Paris.

Edwards G. (1998) The development and promotion of measures for vulnerable road users with regard to mobility integrated with safety. Pedal cyclist. Project report PR/SE/441/98, contribution to Promising, TRL Transport Research Laboratory, Crowthorne, Great Britain.

Elvik, R. (2001). "Area-wide urban traffic calming schemes: a meta-analysis of safety effects." Accident Analysis and Prevention 33: 327-336.

Elvik, R. (2011) Publication bias and time-trend bias in meta-analysis of bicycle helmet efficacy: A re-analysis of Attewell, Glase and McFadden, 2001. Accident analysis and Prevention, 43, pp. 1245-1251.

Engel, U., and L. Thomsen, L. (1992). "Safety effects of speed reducing measures in Danish residential areas." Accident Analysis and Prevention 24(1): 17-28.

European Transport Safety CouncilETSC (1995). Reducing traffic injuries resulting from excess and inappropriate speed. European Transport Safety Council. Brussels, Belgium

ETSC (1999) Exposure data for travel risk assessment: current practice and future needs in the EU. European Transport Safety Council, Brussels, Belgium.

ETSC (2003) ETSC position on the Commission proposal on pedestrian protection. European Transport Safety Council ETSC, Brussels.

ETSC (2006). - European Transport Safety Council. "A methodogical approach to national road safety policies". European Transport Safety Council. Brussels, Belgium Brussels, 2006.

Farlie, R. and M. Taylor, M. (1990). Evaluating the safety benefits of local area traffic management. Proceedings of the 15th ARRB conference.

Transport

Fishbein, M., and Ajezeb, I. (1975). Belief, attitude, intention and behaviour: An introduction to theory and research. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Goldenbeld, Ch. (1992) Ongevallen van oudere fietsers in 1991 [Accidents of older cyclists in 1991]. R-92-71. SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research, Leidschendam.

Goudswaard, A.P. & Janssen, E.G. (1990) Passieve veiligheid bedrijfsvoertuigen; Een literatuuronderzoek. [Passive safety of commercial vehicles; a literature study]. (In Dutch) TNO-report 754080030. TNO Road-Vehicles Research Institute IW-TNO, Delft.

Hansen, F. (1995) Cyclist's safety in Europe; A comparison between selected European studies. Rådet for Trafiksikkerhedsforskning, Gentofte, Denmark.

Hydén, C., Nilsson, A. & Risser, R. (1998) WALCYNG: how to enhance WALking and CYcliNG instead of shorter car trips and to make these modes safer: final report. Lund Bulletin No. 165. Department of Traffic Planning and Engineering, University of Lund, Lund.

D Hynd, D., R Cuerden, R., S Reid, S., S Adams, S. "(2009).The potential for cycle helmets to prevent injury - A review of the evidence". TRL Ltd. (2009). PPR446. UK.

Jacobson, P.L. (2003) Safety in numbers: more walkers and bicyclists, safer walking and bicycling. Injury Prevention 9 (3), pp. 205-209.

Jager, D. de, Torenstra, J., Haas, J. de & Spapé, I. (2006) Veilige kindcorridor in steden; Kindlint zet dit jaar eerste stapjes in Amsterdam en Delft. Verkeerskunde, 57(4), pp. 34-39.

Kampen, L.T.B. van & Schoon, C.C. (1999) De veiligheid van vrachtauto's; Een ongevals- en maatregelenanalyse in opdracht van Transport en Logistiek Nederland. [The safety of lorries; An accident and measures analysis commissioned by the Dutch Transport Operators Association]. (In Dutch). R-99-31. SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research, Leidschendam.

Kampen, L.T.B. van (2007) Gewonde fietsers in het ziekenhuis; Een analyse van ongevallen-en letselgegevens. R-2007-9. Stichting Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Verkeersveiligheid SWOV, Leidschendam.

Kempen, E. van, Swart, W., Wendel-Vos, G., Steinberger, P., Knol, H. & Reurings, M. (2010) Exchanging car trips by cycling in the Netherlands; A first estimation of health benefits. RIVM Report 630053001. Bilthoven, the Netherlands: RIVM, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment.

Kloeden, C. N., McLean, A. J., Moore, V. M. & Ponte, G. (1997) Travelling speed and the rate of crash involvement. Volume 1: findings. Report No. CR 172. Federal Office of Road Safety FORS, Canberra.

Kloeden, C. N., Ponte, G. & McLean, A. J. (2001) Travelling speed and the rate of crash involvement on rural roads. Report No. CR 204. Australian Transport Safety Bureau ATSB, Civic Square, ACT.

Lindenmann, H. (2005). "The effects on road safety of 30 kilometer-per-hour- zone signposting in residential districts." ITE Journal.

Lynam, D., Nilsson, G., Morsink, P., Sexton, B., Twisk, D.A.M., Goldenbeld, C. & Wegman, F.C.M. (2005) An extended study of the development of road safety in Sweden, United Kingdom, and the Netherlands. Leidschendam, SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research / Crowthorne, Berkshire, Transport Research Laboratory TRL / Linköping, Swedish National Road and Transport Research Institute VTI.

Macpherson, A.K., Parkin, T.C. & To, P.M. (2001) Mandatory helmet legislation for the uptake of helmet use and prevention of head injuries. Injury Prevention, 7(3), pp. 228-230.

Methorst, R. (2010) Letselongevallen van voetgangers en fietsers. Rijkswaterstaat, Dienst verkeer en Scheepvaart.

OECD (1998) Safety of vulnerable road users. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development OECD, Paris.

OECD (2004) Keeping children safe in traffic Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development OECD, Paris.

Olkkonen, S. & Honkanen, R. (1990) The role of alcohol in nonfatal bicycle injuries. Accident analysis and Prevention, 22(1), pp. 89-96.

Ormel, W. (2009) Hoofdletsel na fietsongevallen. Stichting Consument en Veiligheid, Amsterdam.

Oxley, J., Corben, B., Fildes, B., O'Hare, M. & Rothengatter, T. (2004) Older vulnerable road users: measures to reduce crash and injury risk. MUARC Report No. 218. Accident Research Centre MUARC, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria.

Phillips, R.O., Bjørnskau, T., Hagman, R. & Sagberg, F. (2011) Reduction in car-bicycle conflict at a road- cycle path intersection: Evidence of road user adaptation? Transportation Research Part F, 14, pp. 87-95.

Phillips, R.O., Fyhri, A. & Sagberg, F. (2011) Risk compensation and bicycle helmets. Risk Analysis, 31(8), pp. 1187-1195.

PROMISING (2001a) Measures for pedestrian safety and mobility problems. Final report of Workpackage 1 of the European research project PROMISING (Promotion of Measures for Vulnerable Road Users), Deliverable D1. National Technical University of Athens NTUA, Athens.

PROMISING (2001b) Measures to promote cyclist safety and mobility. Final report of Workpackage 2 of the European research project PROMISING (Promotion of Measures for Vulnerable Road Users), Deliverable D2. Technical Research Centre of Finland VTT, Espoo

PROMISING (2001c) Cost-benefit analysis of measures for vulnerable road users. Final report of Workpackage 5 of the European research project PROMISING (Promotion of Measures for

Transport

Vulnerable Road Users), Deliverable D5. Transport Research Laboratory TRL, Crowthorne, Berkshire

Reurings, M.C.B. & Bos, N.M. (2009) Ernstig gewonde verkeersslachtoffers in Nederland in 1993-2008; Het werkelijk aantal in ziekenhuis opgenomen verkeersslachtoffers met een MAIS van ten minste 2. R-2009-12. Stichting Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Verkeersveiligheid SWOV, Leidschendam.

Robinson, D.L. (2006) Do enforced bicycle helmet laws improve public health? No clear evidence from countries that have enforced the wearing of helmets. British Medical Journal, 332(7543), pp. 722-725.

Rosén, E., Stigson, H. & Sander, U. (2011) Literature review of pedestrian fatality risk as a function of car impact speed. Accident Analysis and Prevention, 43, pp. 25-33.

Ryley, T., Halliday, M. & Emmerson, P. (1998) Toucan crossings; Trials of nearside equipment. TRL Report No. 331. Transport Research Laboratory TRL, Crowthorne, Berkshire.

Schoon, C.C. (1996) Invloed kwaliteit fiets op ongevallen; Een ongevallenanalyse aan de hand van een schriftelijke enquête [Impact of bicycle quality on accidents]. R-96-32. SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research, Leidschendam.

Schoon, C.C. (2004) Botsingen van het type 'fietser - autofront'; Factoren die het ontstaan en de letselernst beïnvloeden [Cyclist- car front collisions; Factors that influence occurrence and injury severity]. R-2003-33. SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research, Leidschendam.

Sentinella, J., & Keigan, M. (2005) Young adolescent pedestrians' and cyclists' road deaths: analysis of police accident files. Prepared for the Department for Transport, Road Safety Division. TRL Report; No. 620 Transport Research Laboratory TRL, Crowthorne, Berkshire

Stipdonk, H. & Reurings, M. (2010) The safety effect of exchanging car mobility for bicycle mobility; Substituting a small number of short car trips with bicycle trips. R-2010-18. Leidschendam, the Netherlands: SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research

Stipdonk, H.J. & Reurings, M.C.B. (2010) The safety-effect of mobility exchange between car and bicycle. R-2010-18, Stichting Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Verkeersveiligheid SWOV, Leidschendam.

Summala, H., Pasanen, E., Räsänen, M. & Sievänen, J. (1996) Bicycle accidents and drivers'visual search at lef tand right turns. Accident analysis and Prevention, 28(2), pp. 147-153.

Summersgill, I. Kennedy, J.V. & Baynes, D. (1996) Accidents at three-arm priority junctions on urban single-carriageway roads. TRL Report PR184. Transport Research Laboratory TRL, Crowthorne.

SWOV (2004) Bicycle facilities on road segments and intersections of distributor roads.

Transport

SWOV (2006a) Pedestrians. SWOV Fact sheet. SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research, Leidschendam.

SWOV Fact sheet. SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research, Leidschendam.

Tight, M.R., Carsten, O.M.J., Kirby, H.R., Southwell, M.T. & Leake, G.R. (1996) A review of road safety research on children as pedestrians: How far can we go towards improving their safety? IATSS Research, 20(2), pp. 69-74.

Vis, A., and A. Dijkstra A. (1992). "Safety Effects of 30 Km/H Zones in the Netherlands." Accident Analysis and Prevention 24(1): 75-86.

Vlakveld, W.P. (2011) Hazard anticipation of young novice drivers; Assessing and enhancing the capabilities of young novice drivers to anticipate latent hazards in road and traffic situations. PhD Thesis, University of Groningen. SWOV dissertation series. Leidschendam, the Netherlands: SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research.

Ward, H.J. et al. (1994) Pedestrian activity and accident risk. AA foundation for Road Safety Research, Basingstoke, Hampshire

Webster, D., and R. Layfield (2007). Review of 20 mph zones in London Boroughs, TRL. PPR243. Wegman, F., Zang, F. & Dijkstra, A. (2010) How to make more cycling good for road safety? Accident Analysis and Prevention.

Wegman, F.C.M. & Aarts, L. (Eds.) (2006) Advancing sustainable safety. Chapter 12: Cyclists and pedestrians (p.155-162). SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research, Leidschendam.

Wegman, F.C.M., Dijkstra, A., Schermers, G. & Van Vliet, P. (2005) Sustainable safety in the Netherlands; Evaluation of a national Road Safety Programme. 85th Annual Meeting of the Transport Research Board. TRB, Washington DC.

WHO (2006). Helmets: a road safety manual for decision-makers and practitioners. World Health Organization (WHO), Geneva.

WHO (2008). Speed Mangement: A road safety manual for decision-makers and practitioners–. World Health Organization and GRSP – Global Road Safety Partnership. "Speed Mangement: A road safety manual for decision-makers and practitioners". ISBN 978-2-940395-04-0. Geneva, 2008.

Wittink (2001) Promotion of mobility and safety of vulnerable road users: final report of the European research project PROMISING (Promotion of Measures for Vulnerable Road Users). D-2001-3. SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research, Leidschendam.

Yamanaka, H., Y. Yamaguchi, Y. et al. (1998). "Effect of area wide traffic calming in Japan: accident and socio-economic studies of Japanese "road-pia" projects in 1980s." Urban Transport IV: Urban Transport and the Environment for the 21st Century.

Transport

Zein, S., E. Geddes, Hemsing, S., Johnson, M.et al. (1997). "Safety benefits of traffic calming." Transportation Research Record 1578, pp.3-10.

Transport

Notes

1. Country abbreviations

	Belgium	BE		Italy	IT		Romania	RO
	Bulgaria	BG		Cyprus	CY		Slovenia	SI
	Czech Republic	CZ		Latvia	LV		Slovakia	SK
	Denmark	DK		Lithuania	LT		Finland	FI
	Germany	DE		Luxembourg	LU		Sweden	SE
	Estonia	EE		Hungary	HU		United Kingdom	UK
	Ireland	IE		Malta	MT			
	Greece	EL		Netherlands	NL		Iceland	IS
	Spain	ES		Austria	AT		Liechtenstein	LI
	France	FR		Poland	PL		Norway	NO
	Croatia	HR		Portugal	PT		Switzerland	CH

2. This 2015 edition of Traffic Safety Synthesis on Pedestrians and Cyclists updates the previous versions produced within the EU co-funded research projects SafetyNet (2008) and DaCoTA (2012). This Synthesis on Pedestrians and Cyclists was originally written in 2008 by Ragnhild Davidse, SWOV and then updated in 2012 by Willem Vlakveld, SWOV and in 2015 by Chris Lines, Transport Consultant.

3. All Traffic Safety Syntheses of the European Road Safety Observatory have been peer reviewed by the Scientific Editorial Board composed by: George Yannis, NTUA (chair), Robert Bauer, KFV, Christophe Nicodème, ERF, Klaus Machata, KFV, Eleonora Papadimitriou, NTUA, Pete Thomas, Un.Loughborough.

4. Disclaimer

This report has been produced by the National Technical University of Athens (NTUA), the Austrian Road Safety Board (KFV) and the European Union Road Federation (ERF) under a contract with the European Commission. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure that the matter presented in this report is relevant, accurate and up-to-date, the Partners cannot accept any liability for any error or omission, or reliance on part or all of the content in another context.

Any information and views set out in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this study. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the use that may be made of the information contained therein.

5. Please refer to this Report as follows:

European Commission, Pedestrians and Cyclists, European Commission, Directorate General for Transport, September 2015.

Transport