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This is a survey report on safe driving, by Brake and Direct Line. Brake publishes regular survey reports on road safety throughout the year. This report is based on a survey of 1,000 car drivers, conducted by an external research agency, Surveygoo.
Cycling UK welcomed the Government’s decision to adopt a Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy in 2015. However, the Strategy itself will need a serious boost if the Government is to achieve its admirable aim “to make cycling and walking a natural choice for shorter journeys” by 2040, thus maximising their health, environmental, economic and other benefits.

The Government currently plans a vast increase in spending on the ‘Strategic Road Network’ (SRN, i.e. England’s motorways and trunk roads). It is also consulting on plans for a new ‘Major Roads Network’ (MRN) comprising more local A roads. Its roads spending plans look set to overwhelm the tiny sums earmarked for walking and cycling. This needs to be rebalanced if we are to tackle urban congestion and pollution, physical inactivity and climate change, rather than worsening them.

If the UK is to reach Dutch or Danish levels of cycle use – where cycling for day-to-day journeys is perfectly normal, for children and pensioners, male and female alike – we will need to develop protected cycle facilities on, or parallel to, all faster or busier roads that would otherwise deter most people from cycling.

The Government and local authorities therefore need to maximise every opportunity to incorporate cycle-friendly design into all highway and traffic schemes – and indeed into new developments and even planned highway maintenance works. Encouragingly, Highways England has recently adopted this principle – known as “cycle-proofing” – for all works relating to motorways and trunk roads, with some excellent new design standards to support it. In the past, these roads have tended to sever local walking and cycling routes, forcing more and more people into their cars for short journeys. It is good that they are now committed to reversing this.

However, we now need to do the same for every other major road in England. With the Government’s consultation on the Major Roads Network now underway, and a lot of funding at stake, this report could not be more timely.

Roger Geffen

Roger Geffen
Policy Director, Cycling UK
IN TRODUCTION

Mary Williams OBE, chief executive, Brake

Billions of pounds are being invested in England’s main roads and motorways, known as our Strategic Road Network (SRN). We are in the middle of stage one of a “Road Investment Strategy” (RIS1), an £11 billion-plus programme expanding and making changes to roads within the SRN between April 2015 and March 2020.

Highways England, the body delivering the strategy, is spending the vast majority of the funds on major improvements, maintenance and renewals. This includes introducing “smart” motorways that have hard shoulder running and that are developed to meet the needs of advancing connected and autonomous technologies, for example to accommodate trials of platooning trucks. The funds are also enabling the development of “expressways”, described as “A roads that can be relied upon to be as well designed as motorways”. Expressways are largely dual carriageways that are “grade separated”, meaning they go over or under junctions with other roads, with no need for vehicles to stop. Expanding the capacity of the SRN is likely to contribute to an increase in traffic; more road space attracts more use of roads by motorised vehicles.

The amount of money specifically ring-fenced for safety improvements on single-carriageway A roads (which have one lane each way, and often have limited safety features such as crash barriers) is very small compared with the amount being spent on motorways and dual carriageways. Within RIS1 around £100 million has been assigned to improving safety on single-carriageway A roads despite these roads having much higher rates of deaths and serious injuries than motorways or dual carriageways. EuroRAP (European Road Assessment Programme), an independent charity which assesses the safety of roads, reported that two-thirds of England’s single-carriageway trunk roads are rated just two stars out of a possible five – compared with the motorway network being 3-star or higher.

A similar sized small pot of funds (around £100 million) has been assigned for cycling safety. Highways England has a Cycling Strategy which aims to work towards “cycling facilities which are safe, separate from traffic.” The strategy says this will mean “progressively creating comprehensive and coherent cycle networks.”

Highways England is currently in an important research phase regarding stage two of RIS (known as RIS2). RIS2 will determine how billions are spent on main roads and motorways during the period 2020–2025. Three of RIS2’s five aims are relevant to Brake’s mission: safety; integration; and the environment. There is a fantastic opportunity to prioritise safe and healthy mobility on the SRN in line with Brake’s ‘vision zero’ approach to stopping all deaths, injuries and pollution on roads. This means segregated routes for cyclists, safe crossing places for people, 5-star rated roads, electric recharging points to enable decarbonisation, and better integration with public transport.

Brake and other NGOs are lobbying for RIS2 to deliver safe and healthy mobility as a priority, with a focus on improving our extensive single-carriageway road network for cyclists, who can move quickly from place to place if given appropriate, segregated facilities. Cycling is a fast mode of transport, not just for city use, causing zero pollution and increasing fitness.

This is a critical time to be publishing drivers’ views on these issues.
WHO WE ASKED

Brake surveyed 1,010 drivers, out of whom 1,000 said they drove cars. Additionally, 63 were van drivers, 50 were lorry or bus drivers, and 114 motorcycle or moped riders. A very small proportion said they drove other types of vehicles, for example tractors. The survey was carried out online by Surveygoo in September 2017.

This is Part 1 of a two-part report on the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Part 1 looks at safe travel on the SRN’s single-carriageway A roads, with Part 2 focused on dual carriageways and motorways.

CASUALTIES AND TARGETS ON THE SRN

Highways England’s ultimate aim, as stated in its five-year Health and Safety Plan, is that “no-one should be harmed when travelling on the Strategic Road Network (SRN)”, with a goal of achieving this by 2040. Highways England has a target of a 40% reduction in people killed and seriously injured (KSI) on the network by 2020 against the 2005–9 average base line.

Achieving this target would make a significant contribution to tackling deaths and injuries on roads in England. At present, more than 230 people die, and more than 1,770 are seriously injured on the SRN annually.

Highways England’s business plan also requires it to “facilitate safe movement for vulnerable road users alongside and across the SRN.” This is a very important addition to enable modal shift from driving cars to cycling and walking, a shift that is essential for healthy mobility. Currently, fear of traffic and lack of segregated space for cycling inhibits most people from cycling on main roads and, in 2016, as in earlier years, just 2% of trips and 1% of total mileage were cycled in England.

Highways England also has a requirement for 90% of travel on the SRN to be on roads with a safety rating of EuroRAP 3-star (or equivalent to a new Highways England Star rating system) by the end of 2020 (stars range from 1 [worst] to 5 [best]).

THE COST BENEFITS OF INVESTING IN ROAD SAFETY AND REDUCING EMISSIONS ON THE SRN

The Department for Transport estimates the “average value of prevention” of each death on the road at more than £1.8 million, and each serious injury at more than £200,000 (based on 2014 data).

The real costs are often higher. For example, it can cost millions of pounds to provide specialist life-long care to someone with a life-changing disability that seriously affects brain or limb functions.

However, using the conservative figures provided by the Department for Transport:

- 231 deaths on the SRN in 2016 x £1.8m value of prevention = £415.8m
- 1,774 serious injuries on the SRN in 2016 x £200,000 value of prevention = £354.8m
- Total cost of deaths and serious injuries on the SRN = £770.6m

Over a five-year period, this equates to a £3.9bn value of prevention. This is more than ten times as much as Highways England is currently expending in RIS1 on additional road safety schemes, cycling schemes, and its ‘innovation and design’ fund put together (£320m).

Highways England also invests funds in safety measures as part of its infrastructure building and maintenance programme. However, this investment may be countered by increased risk from an extended network with growing volumes of traffic. It is reasonable to argue, therefore, that the £320m budget set aside for additional safety, cycling, and innovation and design is too small compared with the cost of deaths and serious injuries on the network. This can be considered especially so given the costs of all injuries, insurance and congestion-related impacts have not been taken into account in this high-level assessment.

Aside from the above calculations, investing in walking and cycling schemes enables modal shift, which reduces pollution from traffic and reduces additional and extensive costs incurred by:

a) the NHS and society from people suffering from, and dying from, respiratory conditions (treating respiratory conditions is estimated to cost the NHS an estimated £4.7bn a year); and

b) climate change.
OUR STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK

PART ONE: SAFE ROADS BETWEEN PLACES

Single-carriageway A roads (only one lane in either direction):

- generally do not have crash barriers between the two lanes, so vehicles can collide head on with each other;
- generally do not have crash barriers at the side of the road, so vehicles can collide with static objects such as trees and signs;
- have many junctions, bends and browns, creating additional hazards and risk of collision;
- often have high speed limits;
- are used by a wide variety of vehicles, from mopeds to large trucks, contributing additional complexities;
- often do not have segregated space to enable cyclists or other forms of active travel to travel the same route safely, away from motorised traffic; and,
- generally carry very low volumes of cyclists.

These aspects of road design contribute to single-carriageway A roads having higher rates of death and injury than dual carriageways and motorways. In England, many single-carriageway A roads are rated poorly for safety by the road safety assessment charity EuroRAP.

We asked drivers the following questions about single-carriageway A roads:

Q1. What are the reasons you drive on single-carriageway A roads?

Nearly all respondents, 986, drive on single-carriageway A roads. These roads enable drivers to connect places and connect with other types of roads (dual carriageways, motorways, urban roads and more minor rural roads). Drivers told us that they most frequently used these roads for personal reasons (e.g. to visit shops / friends) and to commute.

- Commuting to and from work 467
- For personal reasons, e.g. to visit shops / friends / places of interest, etc. 888
- Weekend riding on a motorbike 88
- While I am working (e.g. delivery driver or driving between appointments) 129
- I don’t drive on single-carriageway A roads 24
- Other 11

Q2: What is the reason you are most likely to drive on single-carriageway A roads?

Drivers who drive on single-carriageway A roads (986 of 1,010 respondents) say they are most likely to drive on these roads for personal reasons and to get to and from work. Consistent with the nature of the sample of respondents, very few said they were most likely to drive on single-carriageway A roads for weekend motorbike riding or while at work (e.g. delivering goods).

I am most likely to drive on single-carriageway A roads...

- For personal reasons, e.g. to visit shops / friends / places of interest, etc. 69.78 % 688
- Commuting to and from work 24.54 % 242
- Weekend riding on a motorbike 1.42 % 14
- While I am working (e.g. delivery driver or driving between appointments) 3.65 % 36
- Other 0.61 % 6

Q2. What is the reason you are most likely to drive on single-carriageway A roads?
Q3: Estimating as best you can, how far do you drive on single-carriageway A roads in an average week?

Nearly all (93%) of drivers who drive on single-carriageway A roads say they drive 100 miles or less in any given week on these roads, with the most common answer being 25 miles or less per week (equivalent to an average daily journey of 3.6 miles or less). Although it is unknown how many of these journeys also included additional driving by respondents on other types of roads or use of public transport, these answers suggest there may be significant potential for many shorter journeys driven on single-carriageway A roads to be replaced by cycling.

- 0-25 miles: 39.55% 390
- 26-50 miles: 27.28% 269
- 51-75 miles: 13.49% 133
- 76-100 miles: 12.27% 121
- More than 100 miles and I do not drive as part of my job: 4.87% 48
- More than 100 miles and that is because I drive as part of my job: 2.54% 25

Q4: What proportion of your total driving distance, on average, is on single-carriageway A roads?

Nearly half (45%) of respondents who drive on single-carriageway A roads said driving on these roads made up more than half, to all, their total driving distance, again supporting the argument that many journeys travelled on these roads could potentially be appropriate to be made by bicycle or public transport.

- Less than a quarter of my total driving distance: 18.15% 179
- Between a quarter and a half of my total driving distance: 36.82% 363
- More than a half but less than three-quarters of my total driving distance: 20.99% 207
- Three-quarters or more of my total driving distance: 24.04% 237

Q5: Do you ever choose to cycle instead of driving on single-carriageway A roads?

More than three-quarters (76%) of drivers who drive on single-carriageway A roads said they never or very infrequently cycle on these roads, with the vast majority of these respondents saying they never do. This is unsurprising given the risks, both real and perceived (see Questions 15 and 16), of using these roads and the lack of segregated space for cyclists.

- Yes – frequently (I cycle on single-carriageway A roads more often than I drive on them): 6.49% 64
- Yes - often (I cycle on single-carriageway A roads about the same number of times as I drive on them): 7.30% 72
- Yes – sometimes (I drive on single-carriageway A roads more often than I cycle on them): 10.04% 99
- Yes – very infrequently (I hardly ever cycle on single-carriageway A roads): 6.09% 60
- No – I never cycle on single-carriageway A roads: 70.08% 691
Q6: Which of the following improvements would persuade you to consider cycling more often, or at all, on the single-carriageway A roads that you use?

- A well-maintained tarmac path for cyclists, separated from the road by a large and raised kerb or a grass verge, or following a different but equally direct route 35.09% 346
- A wider road with a painted line on it to mark a cycle lane from the lane for motorised traffic 18.15% 179
- Nothing - I would never cycle on a single-carriageway A road 46.75% 461

Q6. Which of the following improvements would persuade you to consider cycling more often, or at all, on the single-carriageway A roads that you use?

Out of those respondents who drive on single-carriageway A roads and who said that nothing would persuade them to cycle on these routes (460 of 1,010 respondents) the most common answers given, by nearly half, were lack of fitness and disinclination. Obesity is contributed to by lack of active travel, creating a vicious circle of people getting less fit because they use cars too much, and then being less inclined to cycle because they are less fit. Conversely, people who cycle can enter a virtuous circle that encourages them to make other positive life decisions, such as eating well.28

- My journeys are too long 92
- It’s too hilly 63
- I am not fit enough 199
- It would take too long 106
- There is nowhere to secure my bicycle safely at the end of my journeys 32
- Bad weather 110
- I just don’t want to 193
- I can’t ride a bicycle 62
- Other reason(s) (please give details) 62

Q7. If you answered ‘Nothing’ to Question 6, state your reasons why.

Q8: Do you have any dependants who are children or teenagers that ride bicycles?

Nearly a third of drivers who drive on single-carriageway A roads also have dependants who are children or teenagers that ride bicycles.

- Yes 31.64% 312
- No 68.36% 674
Q9: If you answered ‘Yes’ to Question 8, what, if anything, do you tell your children/teenagers about cycling on single-carriageway A roads?

Of the 312 respondents who have children or teenagers that ride bicycles, only 20 respondents stated that they tell their dependants it is safe to cycle on single-carriageway A roads. This demonstrates a widespread understanding among drivers and parents that these roads are risky for cyclists and not appropriate or safe for children or teenagers to cycle on independently.

- I tell them these roads are dangerous and warn them not to cycle on these roads ever 116
- I tell them these roads are dangerous and warn them to only cycle on these roads with me or another adult 116
- I tell them these roads are dangerous and tell them to take care on these roads 125
- I tell them it is safe to cycle on these roads 20
- I don’t talk to them about cycling on single-carriageway A roads 25
- Other 6

Q9. If you answered ‘Yes’ to Question 8, what, if anything, do you tell your children/teenagers about cycling on single-carriageway A roads?

In Question 10, we asked drivers to tell us to what extent they agreed or disagreed with six different statements about single-carriageway A roads.

Q10a: “Too many drivers overtake dangerously on single-carriageway A roads, and risk hitting a vehicle coming the other way.”

More than 8 out of 10 drivers agree or strongly agree that too many drivers overtake dangerously on single-carriageway A roads and risk hitting a vehicle coming the other way. Drivers recognise that overtaking happens, happens in the wrong places, and is a threat to life.

- Strongly agree 36.31 % 358
- Agree 44.22 % 436
- Neither agree nor disagree 15.72 % 155
- Disagree 3.04 % 30
- Strongly disagree 0.71 % 7

Q10a. Too many drivers overtake dangerously on single-carriageway A roads, and risk hitting a vehicle coming the other way

Q10b: "There are not enough double white lines (that forbid overtaking) in the middle of bendy A roads.”

More than six out of ten drivers who drive on single-carriageway A roads agreed or strongly agreed that there are not enough double white lines (that forbid overtaking) in the middle of bendy A roads. This finding indicates that drivers think double white lines are adhered to by most sensible drivers and are lacking in places where it is dangerous to overtake.

- Strongly agree 22.72 % 224
- Agree 37.32 % 368
- Neither agree nor disagree 30.63 % 302
- Disagree 8.32 % 82
- Strongly disagree 1.01 % 10

Q10b. There are not enough double white lines (that forbid overtaking) in the middle of bendy A roads
**Q10c: “There is not enough space for cyclists on single-carriageway A roads.”**

Three out of four drivers, who use single-carriageway A roads, agree or strongly agree that there needs to be more space for cyclists on the single-carriageway A road network.

- Strongly agree 33.06 % 326
- Agree 41.28 % 407
- Neither agree nor disagree 19.88 % 196
- Disagree 4.56 % 45
- Strongly disagree 1.22 % 12

**Q10d: “Cyclists deserve fast and segregated routes to enable them to travel far between places; painted white lines marking cycle lanes is not a safe option.”**

More than six out of ten drivers, who use single-carriageway A roads, agree or strongly agree that “cyclists deserve fast and segregated routes to enable them to travel far between places” and that “painted white lines marking cycle lanes is not a safe option.” This answer indicates there is good support for investment in segregated cycle lanes on the SRN and that there is a recognition of the inherent risks for cyclists of sharing road space with motorised traffic on single-carriageway A roads.

- Strongly agree 28.19 % 278
- Agree 35.90 % 354
- Neither agree nor disagree 24.34 % 240
- Disagree 8.01 % 79
- Strongly disagree 3.55 % 35

**Q10e: “60mph speed limits are too fast to assure the safety of cyclists on single-carriageway A roads.”**

Nearly six out of ten drivers, who use single-carriageway A roads, agree that 60mph speed limits are too fast to assure the safety of cyclists on these roads, indicating that many drivers recognise that vehicle speed is a fundamental cause of cycling casualties.

- Strongly agree 25.46 % 251
- Agree 32.96 % 325
- Neither agree nor disagree 25.56 % 252
- Disagree 12.37 % 122
- Strongly disagree 3.65 % 36

**WHITE LINES AND RUMBLE STRIPS**

The European Road Federation says there is strong evidence that road markings are a low cost, and effective, crash prevention mechanism. Well-maintained road markings are also increasingly helpful to enable the effective use of lane departure warning systems (an advanced driver assistance system increasingly fitted to vehicles).

There are a variety of additional road marking solutions that work to draw attention to drivers’ requirement to stay on the correct side of the road. Notably this includes Audio Tactile Profiled (ATP) road markings (also known as rumble strips), which are increasingly being installed in countries such as New Zealand in the middle of long rural main roads. The rumbling noise alerts drivers if they cross the centre line.

**WHI TE L INES AND RUM BLE STRIPS**

The European Road Federation says there is strong evidence that road markings are a low cost, and effective, crash prevention mechanism. Well-maintained road markings are also increasingly helpful to enable the effective use of lane departure warning systems (an advanced driver assistance system increasingly fitted to vehicles).

There are a variety of additional road marking solutions that work to draw attention to drivers’ requirement to stay on the correct side of the road. Notably this includes Audio Tactile Profiled (ATP) road markings (also known as rumble strips), which are increasingly being installed in countries such as New Zealand in the middle of long rural main roads. The rumbling noise alerts drivers if they cross the centre line.

**OUR STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK – PT. 1**

Direct Line & Brake Reports on Safe Driving: Safe Roads Between Places
Q11: If you were the Government, and you had a limited amount of money to spend on improving single-carriageway A roads, which of the following would you prioritise?

More than half (53%) of drivers who drive on single-carriageway A roads want the Government to prioritise building segregated, tarmacked cycle paths alongside the single-carriageway A road network, with these paths separated from the road by a large and raised kerb or grass verge or following an entirely different route (to reduce traffic and emissions and enable healthy cycling).

These drivers would prefer the Government to prioritise this work rather than making these roads into dual carriageways with central reservations and crash barriers (to give similar safety standards for vehicle occupants as on motorways, and increased space for vehicles). This demonstrates that many drivers understand that the priority is safety for all, not just for people in vehicles, and enabling active, healthy mobility to reduce congestion and pollution. A similar proportion of drivers said they would be interested in cycling instead of driving if there was separate space for cyclists (see Question 6).

Q10f: “Warning signs telling drivers to look out for cyclists don’t help protect cyclists on bendy single carriageway A roads.”

Nearly seven out of ten drivers, who use single-carriageway A roads, agree that “warning signs telling drivers to look out for cyclists don’t help protect cyclists on bendy single-carriageway A roads”.

There is evidence that warning signs, or signs encouraging “sharing the road” may be missed, ignored by drivers who are busy thinking about other things, or misunderstood. Drivers can also suffer from “drive familiarity”, meaning that they become over-complacent that there will not be a cyclist around the next bend because they are not used to seeing cyclists on that route and are mainly focused on looking out for other vehicles.

Q10f: Warning signs telling drivers to look out for cyclists don’t help protect cyclists on bendy single carriageway A roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.38%</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>23.83%</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11: If you were the Government, and you had a limited amount of money to spend on improving single-carriageway A roads, which of the following would you prioritise?

- Making them dual carriageways with central reservations and crash barriers (to give similar safety standards for vehicle occupants as on motorways, and increased space for vehicles) 24.95% 246
- Providing segregated cycle paths, made of tarmac, separated from the road by a large and raised kerb or a grass verge, or following an entirely different route (to reduce traffic and emissions and enable healthy cycling) 53.25% 525
- Neither of the above - I wouldn’t change single-carriageway A roads 21.81% 215

CASE STUDY: CHERYL BARNETT, BRAKE VOLUNTEER

In August 2014, Cheryl and Andrew Barnett went on a family caravan holiday in Devon. Andrew was training for a cycle race and brought his road bike on the trip. One afternoon, he went out for a cycle but never returned – a driver had hit Andrew from behind at speed, claiming that he had not seen him. The police informed Cheryl that the road been straight with clear visibility and the driver eventually pleaded guilty to causing death by careless driving.

Cheryl says: “There is an urgent need for investment in proper, segregated paths for cyclists, away from traffic on fast roads like the one my husband was tragically killed on. The combination of narrow, single-carriageway roads, bends and 60mph limits is highly dangerous for those on bicycles. A comprehensive network of segregated routes for cyclists, between towns, is critical to reducing needless road deaths.”
Q12: On the journeys you most commonly make using single-carriageway A roads, is there a public transport alternative?

Nearly three-quarters (74%) of drivers said that there was a public transport alternative to their journey involving single-carriageway A roads.

- Yes - I can travel directly to my destination by public transport 28.30% 279
- Yes - I can travel by public transport but there is no direct service (I need to change on my journey) 26.88% 265
- Yes - there is a train service only 3.85% 38
- Yes - there is a bus service only 14.60% 144
- Yes - there is a tram service only 0.30% 3
- No - there is no public transport available 26.06% 257

Q12. On the journeys you most commonly make using single-carriageway A roads, is there a public transport alternative?

Out of the 727 drivers who said they had a public transport alternative, but choose never to use it, the most common reasons given related to convenience and cost, with respondents telling us that public transport took longer than driving, was more expensive, and didn’t take them exactly where they wanted to go. These results support academic views indicating that people are more much inclined to use other modes of transport if it is perceived to be convenient and beneficial to them personally.

- It doesn’t take me exactly where I need to go 107
- The bus or train stop is too far away from where I live 36
- It takes longer than driving 134
- It’s more expensive than driving 109
- Other reason (please give details) 43

Q14: If you have a public transport alternative and don’t use it at all, why not?

Out of 245 drivers who told us they have a public transport alternative, but choose never to use it, the most common reasons given related to convenience and cost, with respondents telling us that public transport took longer than driving, was more expensive, and didn’t take them exactly where they wanted to go. These results support academic views indicating that people are more much inclined to use other modes of transport if it is perceived to be convenient and beneficial to them personally.

Q14 If you have a public transport alternative and don’t use it at all, why not?

Q15: How likely do you think it is that you could be involved in a fatal or serious crash on a single-carriageway A road at some point in the future, while either a vehicle driver or passenger?

Fewer than one in four drivers who drive on single-carriageway A roads thought it was unlikely or highly unlikely that they would be involved in a fatal or serious crash on these roads. More than a quarter (28%) described it as “likely or highly likely” that they would be involved in a fatal or serious crash. These results starkly demonstrate that drivers using single-carriageway A roads understand these roads contain serious hazards for motorised vehicle users and themselves personally.

- Highly likely 6.49% 64
- Likely 21.10% 208
- Neither likely nor unlikely 37.42% 369
- Unlikely 16.84% 166
- Highly unlikely 8.11% 80
- Don’t know 10.04% 99

Q15. How likely do you think it is that you could be involved in a fatal or serious crash on a single-carriageway A road at some point in the future, while either a vehicle driver or passenger?
Q16: Thinking about all the single-carriageway A roads you use, rate overall the level of risk that is posed to cyclists using these roads.

Nearly half (45%) of drivers who drive on single-carriageway A roads say these roads pose a high or very high risk to cyclists, and nearly all (92%) recognise that the risk is moderate, high or very high. Only one in 12 drivers would describe these roads as being low or no risk to cyclists.

- Very high risk: 15.42% 152
- High risk: 29.61% 292
- Moderate risk: 46.55% 459
- Low risk: 6.80% 67
- No risk: 1.62% 16

Q16. Thinking about all the single-carriageway A roads you use, rate overall the level of risk that is posed to cyclists using these roads.

Very high risk 15.42%
High risk 29.61%
Moderate risk 46.55%
Low risk 6.80%
No risk 1.62%

Q17. Each of Britain’s main roads (single-carriageway A roads, dual carriageways and motorways) has a star rating (out of five, with five being safest) for its safety standards. Tick statements that apply to you.

- I already knew that main roads are given a star rating for safety.
- I didn’t know that main roads are given a star rating for safety - this is news to me.
- I don’t know the star rating of main roads I use, nor how to find it out, and think this should be publicised.
- I do know the star rating of main roads I use.
- If I had to guess, I’d say that most single carriageway A roads had low star ratings.
- If I had to guess, I’d say that most single carriageway A roads had high star ratings.

EURORAP SAFETY RECOMMENDATIONS
EuroRAP identifies several ways in which the safety rating of main A roads can be improved. It advises the use of detailed crash data to determine appropriate “countermeasure treatments” to improve road infrastructure, including:
- run-off protection using safety fencing and returning tree lines to safe distances;
- providing protected right-turns at busy junctions;
- ensuring that lay-bys meet EuroRAP standards;
- ensuring edge-of-carriageway marking and shoulder sealing (permanently sealing the surface of the road shoulder with a treatment which aids grip);
- use of lower-cost, split-level junction types, or “compact grade-separation” (grade separation is the separation of different flows of traffic using physical means); and
- trialling innovative 4-star single-carriageway types.

Out of 930 respondents to this question, the vast majority did not know the star ratings of the main roads that they use. They also thought (correctly) that most single-carriageway A roads did not have high star ratings. In 2015, Highways England stated that 63% of the SRN’s single-carriageway A roads were rated 2-star or lower, 33% were rated 3-star, just 4% were rated 4-star and no roads had the highest 5-star rating.
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