

Report for: Overview and Scrutiny Committee – June 2026

Title: Interim Report – Walking and Cycling Safety Scrutiny Review

Report authorised by: Ayshe Simsek, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager

Lead Officer: Fola Irikefe, Principal Scrutiny Support Officer
E-mail: folia.irikeye@haringey.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

1. Describe the issue under consideration

This report provides an update on the progress made thus far of the Culture, Climate and Community Safety Scrutiny panels review of walking and cycling safety in the borough. The primary objective of the review is to consider what else can be done to facilitate those walking and cycling in the borough to ensure that they are safe in line with the objectives of the councils Walking and Cycling Action Plan. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider and comment as necessary on the contents of the update report. The report details recommended actions and next steps for the review.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To continue with the review for a time limited period as part of the 2026/27 Work Programme of the Culture, Community Safety and Environment Scrutiny Panel, exploring the areas highlighted in more detail within the main body of the report. The Panel should address the following areas:

A) Safety and Education

Recommendation 1: That the Panel consider a progress update in respect of safety for e-bike user and what has been implemented/ is planned to be implemented by the council and the chosen provider.

Recommendation 2 : That the Panel should follow up with Haringey officers to establish the progress regarding whether a London-wide agreement for operators to have built in safety objectives in relation to how they are helping to improve pedestrian safety is progressing.

B) Enforcement

Recommendation 3: That the Panel considers the outcomes of the decision Cabinet made in March 2026 regarding a chosen provider for e-bikes. The Panel should explore whether a pan-London contract to have a universal licensing framework for dockless e-bikes to manage some of the issues around enforcement

and deal with unregulated, inconsistent operators across different boroughs is developed. This is something that was in development that the Panel were informed about at their meeting in September 2025.

Recommendation 4: That the Panel considers data around enforcement and whether there are any hotspots and areas of high usage with significant non-compliance.

C) Public Consultation & Engagement

Recommendation 5 : The Panel should consider the outcomes and results from all the recent and ongoing Common Place consultations. In particular, the responses following the implementation of the new contract.

Recommendation 6 : The Panel should also explore the work of the Micromobility Group drawing on any good practice that can inform the final recommendations.

Recommendation 7: That the Panel should consider and analyse existing perception data from previous consultations, including the Kerbside Strategy, EV Strategy and Transport Strategy.

D) Infrastructure

Recommendation 8: The Panel should consider planned changes to infrastructure and progress with the rollout of more dockless parking bays they were briefed about.

Recommendation 9 : The Panel should consider any other infrastructure plans and include liaison with officers at TfL as part of their evidence gathering.

Recommendation 10 : That the Panel considers an update on the progress of the work being done to increase the visibility of walking routes.

E) Collision and hotspots

Recommendation 11: That the Panel consider the key areas highlighted by residents for potential site visits and also cross reference these with the collision data provided at the February 2026 meeting.

3. Background and Policy Context

- 3.1 The Culture, Community Safety and Environment Scrutiny Panel set out to review the implementation of the Walking and Cycling Action Plan at their meeting in March 2025. The review was prompted as a result of an increase in member enquiries in relation to the dangerous powered two-wheelers and the negative impact abandoned dockless bikes were having on accessibility for vulnerable road users.

3.2 The Panel refined and narrowed their scope in September 2025 to focus on the Walking and Cycling Action Plan in the context of exploring ‘*what does safe cycling look like for the everyone in Haringey*’.

3.3 The review explored:

- Elements of the Walking and Cycling Action Plan/ Active Transport Policy/ Streets for People Investment Plan - 2025/26 to 2029/30,
- the impact of safety as a result of increased cycling in the borough,
- current and proposed infrastructure to support cyclists in the borough (rollout of more dockless bike bays to support LTN’s and School Streets, re-tendering of contracts etc),
- the increase in use of electric bikes (obstructing vulnerable users being the most frequent public concern),
- the issue of enforcement
- consideration of existing data in respect of obstruction/ injuries/ complaints regarding-e-bikes,
- good practice in other boroughs and what else can be done to improve the experience of our residents both as cyclists and also pedestrians, and
- resident and key stakeholder engagement.

4. Scrutiny Review Evidence Gathering

4.1 The Scrutiny Panel have so far considered evidence and consulted the following stakeholders:

- Councillor Ibrahim Ali, previously Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment
- Councillor Seema Chandwani, previously Cabinet Member for Resident Services & Tackling Inequality
- Councillor Mike Hakata, (Former) Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment, and Transport
- Rob Krzyszowski, Director of Planning and Building Standards
- Maurice Richards, Head of Transport, Travel & Building Standards
- Naima Ihsan, Principal Transport Planner
- Key stakeholders in the borough including members of public detailed in the section below

4.2 The Panel gathered the majority of their evidence at their Panel meetings, drawing on the expertise of officers in the council to set the scene. The Panel’s meeting in September 2025 focussed on considering desk top evidence already available in order to refine the broad scope that had been mapped out in March 2025. The Scrutiny Panel reviewed the June 2025 Walking and Cycling Action Plan update as well as the Streets for People Investment Plan 2025/26 to 2029/30 with a briefing from former Councillor Mike Hakata, Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment, and Transport and also the Head of Transport, Travel & Building Standards.

- 4.3 Consideration was also given to the current and proposed infrastructure to support cyclists and pedestrians in the borough through a presentation from the Head of Transport, Travel & Building Standards. The Panel heard that the authority was rolling out fixed dockless bike parking locations and the first forty had been implemented with another hundred planned by the end of 2025 and a further hundred in the year to follow with the view to having them 100 meters from each other.
- 4.4 The Scrutiny Panel also considered other initiatives to support the cycling infrastructure including:
- Cycleways Network Development (CND): Over £19.9m has been allocated in 2024/25 for developing high-priority cycling schemes, following TfL's Healthy Streets criteria.
 - Active Travel Zones & LTNs: The council is developing LTNs and "Streets for People" projects, focusing on reducing motor vehicle dominance and encouraging cycling.
 - School Streets: this scheme is being expanded and will restrict motor traffic during drop-off/pick-up times to create safe, walkable, and cycle-friendly areas.
 - Cycle Parking: Expansion of secure residential bike hangars is a key priority to match demand for cycle storage.
 - Station Road (N22) Upgrades: Improvements include converting advisory lanes into mandatory lanes for better north-to-south connectivity.
 - C1 Extension: The extension of Cycleway 1 (C1) to Queen Street is aimed at improving safety and connectivity.
- 4.6 At a meeting in September 2025, the Head of Transport and Travel briefed the Panel on the dockless bike trial with Lime and Forest which commenced in February 2024. The Panel learned that the contract was out to tender and the would be awarded on the basis of stronger enforcement, greater support e.g. with education programmes, expanded fixed parking locations and faster response to the clearance and removal of obstructions. It was explained that a future dockless bike contract was to be awarded in March 2026 which would include a revenue-share model, stronger KPIs for enforcement and a re-launch of resident engagement following the selection of the provider. The Panel were also briefed on the work being done with the London Micromobility Group (a network of urban mobility leaders, industry partners, and advocates in London).
- 4.7 The meeting in December 2025 saw the Panel further narrow down the information they required to fully explore the issue of safety and how they could go about ascertaining if dockless bikes had resulted negatively on safety. The Panel wanted to better understand collision data and the hotspot areas in the borough where there are potentially heightened safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists. It was understood by the Panel that collision data provides some semblance of the safety concerns, however, the collision data was only on incidents reported to police, so it did not give the full picture as there is the likelihood of collisions that were not recorded and a significant number of near misses.

- 4.8 Due to the fact that not all the incidents will be formally reported to the police and it was likely these are the most severe cases, the Panel felt it was particularly important to have direct engagement with the public as part of the review. The Panel also planned to gather evidence through a site visit to hotspots in the borough in terms of collisions once they were identified.
- 4.9 The collision data was considered at the Panel's February 2026 meeting where the Director of Planning and Building Standards took the Councillors through the collision data involving cyclists, pedestrians, and other vulnerable road users between January 2022 and December 2024. This data showed that there had been an increase in collisions as a result of increased use of e-bikes. The Panel were also able to identify potential hotspots for a future site visit.

5. Key Issues Considered by the Scrutiny Panel

Detailed below are the are the key themes and topics that have been considered so far by the Scrutiny Panel.

5.1 Dockless Bikes

At the Panel's meeting in September 2025, the Head of Transport and Travel explained that like many other London authorities, dockless bike are now incorporated as part of the Walking and Cycling Action Plan as accessibility to bikes is one of the challenges for people taking up cycling as a mode of transport. The Panel acknowledged that dockless bikes provided much needed access to bikes for a large section of the community, however, they also expressed that the cycling infrastructure shouldn't be to the expense of other modes of transport including walking.

The dockless bikes in the borough were initially implemented as an eighteen-month trial to give the authority the opportunity to consider lessons learnt and safeguards to be put in place before a new contract was awarded in March 2026. It was proposed that the new contract will have additional restrictions on the chosen operator to reduce the negative impact on residents. The Panel also learnt about a clear timetable for the roll out of increased fixed dockless bike parking locations.

The new contract would include the following stipulations:

- The service provider must redeploy a non-compliantly parked bike within 3 hours of it being reported
- Dynamic Fleet Review
- Increased patrol in hotspot areas of Haringey via consistent monitoring of the user database
- Campaigns to be run in schools to target those who are using dockless bikes underage to show them the danger of using the bikes
- Stricter fines on non-compliant users
- Concessions for lower income groups

- Operators to pay any upfront cost to cover the council's cost and contribute to cycle training and a share of profits.

5.2 Electronic Bikes

At the September 2025 meeting, the Panel discussed the increased use of powered two-wheelers and the lawlessness of some of the riders. This has been reflected in the increased number of Member Enquiries received as a result of safety concerns. The Panel discussed the reason for the rise in the use of electronic bikes, a knock on effect of the rise of the delivery economy. It was explained that further education and a safety publicity campaign highlighting safety measure e.g. the need to wear high visibility clothing needed to be carried out for those in the gig economy to boost the safety of pedestrians and for the safety of the riders themselves. The Panel were also briefed that there are some challenges with some of the drivers as English is not always their first language.

The Travel Team have recognised these issues and were working to address them as part of the Council's Vision Zero commitment with initiatives like the "Pavements Are for Pedestrians" campaign, engaging delivery drivers in multiple languages, promoting road safety awareness and offering incentives such as cycle training and high-visibility gear.

Recommendation: That the Panel consider progress with the initiatives the council and the chosen provider will be employing that they were briefed on at their meeting in December 2025.

5.3 Enforcement

Developing enforcement systems with robust KPI's in terms of retrieving e-bikes and dealing with complaints was essential when awarding a contract going forward and officers had learnt this as result of the trial period. The Head of Transport and Travel explained to the Panel that the objective was to have a tighter contract and systems in place whereby if operators are performing well, the number of bikes will be increased and if they are under performing there will be a reduction.

Recommendation: That the Panel considers the outcomes of the decision Cabinet will make in March 2026 regarding a chosen provider for e-bikes. The Panel should explore whether a pan-London contract to have a universal licensing framework for dockless e-bikes to manage some of the issues around enforcement and deal with unregulated, inconsistent operators across different boroughs is developed. This is something that was in development that the Panel were informed about at their meeting in September 2025.

Recommendation: That the panel considers data around enforcement and whether there are any hotspots and area of high usage with significant non-compliance

5.4 Good Practice, Public Consultation & Engagement

The authority is part of the Micromobility Working Group looking at best practice across London. Officers would continue to work with the Micromobility Group and liaise with residents and public through the council's communication platform, Common Place. Once a contract has been awarded for the dockless bikes a Common Place evaluation exercise will be re-launched in order to monitor what is working well and consider where there may be challenges

The Kerbside Strategy is focussed on issues relating to safer, healthier and more livable streets with the objective of reallocating kerbside space and the Panel heard about the consultation undertaken in November 2025 on the Kerbside Strategy at their meeting in February 2026. Building on insights from the initial engagement that took place in early 2025, this consultation sought feedback from residents, businesses and stakeholders on the proposed measures and priorities outlined in the draft strategy.

A Common Place exercise on motorcycle safety was launched in February 2026 and will run until mid-March 2026. The Panel will consider the outcomes of this as part of their review, focussing on the responses to the safety questions that may be relevant to walking and cycling.

Recommendation: The Panel should consider the outcomes from all the recent and ongoing Common Place consultations. In particular, the responses following the implementation of the new contract. The Panel should also explore the work of the Micromobility Group drawing on any good practice that can inform the final recommendations.

5.5 Infrastructure

The Head of Transport and Travel briefed the Panel that over the next five years the authority was in good position for walking and cycling infrastructure because of external funding from TfL. The Panel also asked for the Travel Team to provide any draft proposals for upcoming cycle infrastructure projects, including their locations and how they will accommodate other road users.

Recommendation The Panel should consider planned changes to infrastructure and progress with the rollout of more dockless bikes parking bays they were briefed about. The panel should consider any other infrastructure plans and include liaison with officers at TfL as part of their evidence gathering.

5.6 Walking

At the September 2025 meeting, it was acknowledged that the visibility of walking routes was an important element of the Walking and Cycling Action Plan that the Panel felt needed developing. Incentivising healthy choices was the objective of the plan and in trying to achieve this, the local authority is working closely with Public Health.

Recommendation: Consider an update on the progress of the work being done to increase the visibility of walking routes.

5.7 Scrutiny Panel engagement with the Public

The Panel were keen to carry out engagement and consultation with the public directly online. They considered the consultation data already available and this feedback, from those actually residing in the borough could help inform potential recommendations for improving safety for both cyclists and pedestrians.

Recommendation: that the Panel should analyse and reflect on existing extensive perception data from previous consultations, including the following:

- Kerbside Strategy
- EV Strategy
- Transport Strategy

5.8 Collisions

At the Panel's scrutiny meeting in December 2025, the Head of Transport and Travel confirmed that there was a rise in collisions involving powered two-wheelers, largely driven by the growth of the delivery industry. It was noted that many of the riders were inexperienced, lacked formal cycle training and were under pressure to work quickly as they were self-employed couriers and all this increases risk.

6. Stakeholders and Resident evidence gathering session – 23 February 2026

- 6.1 The Panel received first hand opinions, views and evidence from key interest groups, voluntary and community organisations and residents at an evidence gathering session in February 2026. Some residents also sent in their views.

The following individuals/ groups provided evidence either in writing or in person:

- Haringey Residents
- Natasha Benn, Chair of the Joint Partnership Board (JPB)
- Amanda Jacobs, Member of Haringey's Joint Partnership Board (JPB) and of the now-defunct Transport Inclusion Group, Chair of City of London Access Group (CoLAG)
- Michael Poteliakhoff, Haringey Cycling Campaign (HCC)
- Ian Sygrave, Chair of the Ladder Community Safety Partnership (LCSP) and the Ward Police Panel
- Ferry Lane Action Group

Much of the information provided and discussions centred around the same issues and topics that had been highlighted at the Panels meetings they had held with officers in the council and the Executive. Detailed in the sections below are the key points that were raised and topics under consideration.

6.2 Accessibility and Inclusivity

Resident opinion sent in stressed that accessibility and inclusivity must underpin all cycling policy, the panel were briefed by the Joint Partnership Board (JPB) that there are around 13,350 disabled residents in the borough that are likely to cycle regularly. The JPB stressed that parking design, geo-fencing, and policy development must therefore be co-produced with disabled and older cyclists.

The JPB also included the following Lived Experience Testimony:

“... the cycle route at the end of Frome Road N22 which turns sharply into a tunnel to get to the north side of Westbury Avenue. If you enter this path from Mannock Road, you can't see round the corner to tell if another cyclist is coming through the tunnel under Westbury Avenue. Cycle couriers for Just Eat, Uber etc come round at great speed and I am terrified of colliding with them as people don't necessarily keep left on the bend and anyway the path is very narrow for two-way cycling. Mirrors are needed so that you can see people coming round the bend from each direction.”

The JPB stressed that ‘Accessibility must be measurable to be meaningful’ so plans to measure any possible changes will need measuring and monitoring consistently.

6.3 Policy, Planning and Good Practice

The Haringey Cycling Campaign (HCC) felt that the objectives of the Walking and Cycling Action Plan were commendable and acknowledged that some progress has been made but they felt that the momentum had stalled despite the fact that more people are cycling in the borough.

The Chair of the Scrutiny Panel gave an example of the need for better planning having been told that a cycle lane was to be implemented in her ward as the funding from TfL had to be utilised. The Chair expressed that there was no communication or consultation about the cycle lane prior to its implementation so agreed that a more cohesive and planned approach was needed.

HCC also briefed the scrutiny panel that in the past TfL had consulted them on design but ultimately went ahead with their own plans. On enquiry from the Panel over what the HCC thought was the challenge for Haringey in terms of improving cycling infrastructure, they expressed that Haringey needed to start gradually with cycle lanes they have identified – initially putting in plastic wands and then upgrading once they have tested them out. The campaign group also expressed that the authorities that tend to do well in respect of developing infrastructure are those that push back to TfL.

HCC commended Camden, Islington, Hackney and Waltham Forest as they are delivering on their aspirations and recommended that the Panel liaises with them about how they approach discussions and negotiations with TfL and felt that they were successful as they often pushed back with them.

In terms of policy development, the Joint Partnership Board (JPB) provided a comprehensive detailed written response to the Panel covering a number of points and they briefed that they are in the process of developing a comprehensive transport strategy for submission to the council, local MP, the Mayor of London, and the Transport Select Committee to address the broader legislative changes required at the regional and national levels.

6.4 Infrastructure

HCC stressed that in order to try and avoid pavement cycling for the safety of disabled, older and vulnerable pedestrians, it can only be possible if the borough has safe continuous and accessible cycling infrastructure. This includes consistent cycle lanes, safer junction design, appropriate vehicle-parking layouts, well-maintained road surfaces and sufficient secure cycle parking. The issue of floating bus stop design and signage and the need to improve it was also highlighted as an area that the council should discuss further with TfL.

The HCC presented their views to the Scrutiny Panel at the evidence gathering session and their focus was very much on the problem areas around the borough and the need to improve infrastructure. The campaign group also shared details of integrated cycle culture and design in other areas of the country such as Kings Lynn and other countries like Japan.

The JPB put forward a number of structural reforms that they felt could be implemented in the borough as part of their submission, amongst which included:

- Mandatory Parking: digitally enforced bays, shared dockless rental vehicle caps, and protection of tactile paving and dropped kerbs.
- Acoustic & Sensory Safety: low-frequency hums (AVAS) and audible bell standards to protect the blind and hard of hearing.
- Hardware-enforced speed
- Inclusive Infrastructure: bays designed for adaptive cycles and recognition of cycles as mobility aids.

The JPB also advised the Scrutiny Panel on the following infrastructure measures including:

- Mandatory digital parking zones and micromobility vehicle capacity alignment
- High-precision location validation
- Acoustic and sensory safety standards
- Behavioural controls against pavement riding and speeding
- Rider induction
- Graduated rider accountability with an enforcement model that increases the repercussions based on number of offences.

- Positive reinforcement and safe cycling incentives such as App-based rewards
- Near-miss, collision and injury data transparency
- consideration should be given to recognising cycles used by disabled residents as mobility aids.

6.5 Signage

The Ferry Lane Action Group provided a written submission and expressed their view that the current infrastructure lacked clarity, including clear signage. The residents' association for the Ferry Lane estate at Tottenham Hale felt that it was unclear whether or not cycles are allowed to go through the bus station. The Action Group highlighted that this was an area that could benefit from signage as cyclists often turn into traffic. Clear signage would also help reduce collisions with pedestrians and buses.

The HCC briefed on the challenges with shared cycle lanes between cyclists and pedestrians, the signage for cyclists is often not clear and so cyclists don't know when they can use the pavements when the space is meant to be shared.

6.6 Safety on Pavements

The Panel received a written submission from a disabled family in the borough who have experienced a number of challenges because of cyclists cycling on pavements. The panel were briefed that they have a disabled son (requiring side-by-side support) who had experienced obstacles and near collisions because of cyclists using pavements, despite on occasion having a cycle lane right next to them. The Panel heard that this individual was hard of hearing and so is often not aware when cyclists are on the pavement, causing them to become a nervous and anxious pedestrian.

The Chair of the LSCP informed the Panel that older, more vulnerable road users don't feel comfortable on the pavement in the borough due to cyclists and the solution is essentially better enforcement.

6.7 Rider Safety

The Ferry Lane Action group also highlighted the issue of cyclists on pavements to the panel in their submission and informed the Panel that there was an increasing number of electric bike users, using the footpath and creating fear amongst pedestrians and in particular older residents. Another issue highlighted by the Ferry Lane Action Group was that a significant number of bikes are not sufficiently lit, including some of those contracted by large delivery organisations. The group stressed that these companies pose a threat to themselves, pedestrians and other road users. Ferry Lane Action Group told the Panel that they would welcome a campaign focussed on lighting and the importance of wearing high visibility attire for cyclists.

HCC briefed the Panel that a London-wide agreement on safety objectives will help with delivery drivers and different levels of enforcement and sentencing ranging from warnings to outright banning for those that flout the rules. In terms of those working in the gig economy, the enforcement could be linked to some form of registration with their employees. A London-wide agreement for operators to have built in safety objectives in relation to how they are helping to improve pedestrian safety standards is something that was felt could be a quick win. This is something currently in place in Brussels.

Recommendation: The Panel should follow up with Haringey officers to establish the progress regarding whether a London-wide agreement for operators to have built in safety objectives in relation to how they are helping to improve pedestrian safety is progressing.

6.8 Education and Training

The HCC informed the Panel that only 1/3 of children are able to cycle on the road and that 70% of children are also leaving school unable to cycle. Infrastructure reform alone is insufficient without sustainable cultural change and education the representative from HCC expressed. The Scrutiny Panel considered that they may want to look further into the issue of training as people including children who have no cycle training are also the ones that may utilise Lime bikes and so they are a danger onto to themselves as well as others.

The JPB also proposed that a mandatory induction programme is developed for cyclists in order for them to understand the needs of pedestrians, carers and vulnerable residents, including those with mobility impairments, sensory sensitivities and cognitive conditions

The JPB also stressed the importance of participation and co-design advising for a regular workshop to enable vulnerable residents, carers and adaptive cycle users to inform parking infrastructure, routes and behavioural guidance as it develops.

The JPB requested a review of dockless bikes micromobility permit conditions to ensure that sustainability and accessibility advance together. The group expressed their issues with risks including obstructed tactile paving, "silent danger" vehicle approaches, unregulated speeds, and a lack of rider accountability and the solution to this being systems-led regulation with safeguards embedded in permits, infrastructure, and technology to prevent hazards before they occur.

6.9 Cyclists Traffic Offences

Ian Sygrave from LSCP provided his view from the perspective of a resident. The Panel were briefed on particular roads he was told were dangerous and that some traffic calming measures on certain roads are also dangerous for cyclists. The Scrutiny Panel were also informed about an experiment carried out by the LCSP on Green Lane to assess the validity of cyclists jumping lights. The experiment took

place in the same position at the same time on Green Lanes and they found that with officers in uniform, in high profile position - every two wheeled vehicles stopped. The experiment was then carried out the next day, at the same time with plain clothed officers and 17 two wheeled vehicles jumped the light.

Anecdotal evidence was provided by Ferry Lane Action Group and colleagues in attendance that cyclists often run through red lights. One of the submissions felt that a strengthened relationship between the council, TfL and the police was necessary to tackle unlawful bike riding.

6.10 Enforcement

Consideration was given to how some local authorities had the ability to seize bikes that were obstructing the path of pedestrians. The Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality explained that the challenge with this approach was that councils needed to have the resources to store the bikes that are seized and this was a significant expense. The Panel heard that the authority is ensuring that the chosen provider will be able to do this at their cost. The Cabinet Member for Climate Action and Environment expressed that the collection in some boroughs can be very seasonal, focussed on a set area but the issue the boroughs are recognising is there isn't enough capacity to store the bikes.

The JPB highlighted that the existing complaint-led system places the burden and ownership on disabled residents to identify and report hazards after they arise and they proposed a systems-led, operator-funded regulatory framework that prevents obstruction and behavioural risk at source.

6.11 Parking Dockless Bikes

A disabled resident who submitted written evidence to the Panel, advised that dockless bikes and in particular Lime Bikes often pose a problem because of the way they are parked or dumped, causing obstruction of the pavement. Specific locations were also detailed in the submission.

The JPB highlighted that the dockless bikes disproportionately affect disabled residents, blind and partially sighted people, deaf and hard-of-hearing residents, neurodivergent people including autistic residents, individuals living with dementia or learning disabilities. The JPB also listed the effects on mobility-impaired pedestrians, residents over 50 experiencing age-related changes in balance, vision and hearing, carers supporting dependants, and disabled cyclists using adapted cycles. The JPB also provided the Panel with locations with recurring obstructions in conflict with high footfall.

Recommendation: That the Panel consider the key areas highlighted by residents for potential site visits and also cross reference these with the collision data provided at the February 2026 meeting.