

# **Accidents by Design: The Holmes Report on “shared space” in the United Kingdom**

Lord Holmes of Richmond MBE

July 2015

## Contents

Foreword .....	3
Executive Summary.....	4
Introduction .....	6
Methodology.....	8
Establishing Experience.....	8
Sample Characteristics .....	8
Results .....	9
Location of the shared spaces used.....	9
Use of shared spaces .....	9
Experience of using shared spaces .....	9
Poor experience of shared spaces.....	10
Good and Fair experience of shared spaces .....	18
General opinion of shared spaces.....	19
Accidents in shared spaces.....	19
Conclusion .....	20
References.....	21
Appendix 1. Tables.....	22
Appendix 2. Questionnaire .....	31

## **Foreword**

In March 2015, I launched a survey to find out about people's experiences of using shared spaces in towns and cities. My aim was to establish a greater understanding of the impact of shared spaces on the public.

I would like to thank all those who contributed to this research; in particular all those who gave their time and effort to tell us about their experiences. This report aims, as far as possible, to let people speak in their own words.

Lord Chris Holmes MBE

## Executive Summary

### Shared Space described by users as:

*“Lethally dangerous” (Pedestrian)*

*“Absolute nightmare that I avoid if I can.” (Driver)*

*“Shared space is a false promise with poor delivery” (Cyclist)*

### Key findings:

- People’s experiences of shared space schemes are overwhelmingly negative.
- Overzealous councils are risking public safety with fashionable ‘simplified’ street design.
- Over a third of people actively avoid shared space schemes.
- 63 per cent of people who have used shared space schemes rated their experience as poor.
- Significant under-reporting of accidents in shared space.

### Key recommendations:

- Immediate moratorium on shared space schemes while impact assessments are conducted.
- Urgent need for accessibility audits of all shared space schemes and a central record of accident data including “courtesy crossings”, which must be defined and monitored.
- Department for Transport must update their guidance so that Local Authorities better understand their responsibilities under the Equalities Act.

Shared space schemes remove regulations and features such as kerbs, road surface markings, traffic signs and controlled crossings. The number of shared space schemes is increasing, with many local authorities planning new schemes, despite the inherent difficulties. Just since this survey closed, new schemes have been announced in the Isle of Man, Kirkintulloch and Buntingford.

This survey asked people with experience of shared space for feedback on using these schemes. The response was extraordinarily negative. This survey clearly shows just how misguided a planning approach that aims to “improve pedestrian movement and comfort” and “enable all users to share space” is when users actually report ‘anxiety’, ‘fear’ and in over a third of cases a refusal to use the space at all.

People constantly referred to finding the schemes 'frightening', 'intimidating', 'dangerous' and 'never feeling safe'. The majority of respondents were pedestrians but we had an extraordinarily broad range of users from pedestrians, with and without disabilities, to drivers, including professional drivers, and cyclists. The survey results also highlighted a worrying trend of under reporting of accidents which also needs urgent attention.

A wealth of qualitative data about a huge range of over 100 shared space schemes paints a picture of public areas people are terrified of using. Local Authorities are repeatedly U-turning and installing or re-installing pedestrian crossings, the cost of which is not yet known but must be assessed. The Department for Transport must inform local authorities of the many risks in these schemes including reinforcing local authorities' responsibilities under The Equality Act.

## Introduction

Shared space is a design approach that aims to reduce the dominance of motor traffic by reducing or removing conventional traffic management such as traffic signs, road markings and in some cases kerbs, resulting in 'level surfaces'. The most controversial elements of many shared space schemes is this removal of kerbs and pedestrian crossings.

There is no single definition of "shared space" but Government guidance defines it as:

'A street or place designed to improve pedestrian movement and comfort by reducing the dominance of motor vehicles and enabling all users to share the space rather than follow the clearly defined rules implied by more conventional designs.' (Department for Transport, 2011).

The same document continues to define sharing as:

'The ability and willingness of pedestrians, facilitated by the sympathetic behaviour of motorists and others to move freely around the street and use parts of it that, in a more conventional layout, would be considered largely dedicated to vehicular use.'

Many local authorities in Britain are enthusiastic about shared space and schemes are being developed and implemented across the country. Incredibly, despite the lack of evidence about how schemes operate in practice and several costly U-turns<sup>1</sup>, the schemes appear increasingly popular. The lack of evidence about the impact of these schemes ranges from an absence of accessibility audits, user experience analysis and accident data. For example "courtesy crossings" or uncontrolled

---

<sup>1</sup> U-turns include: Grimsby <http://m.grimsbytelegraph.co.uk/Council-makes-U-turn-junction-Grimsby-town-centre/story-22836811-detail/story.html> Warwick <http://www.leafingtoncourier.co.uk/news/local-news/work-finally-complete-to-make-warwick-town-centre-safer-1-5824989> and most recently Hackbridge, Sutton <http://www.newsroomsutton.co.uk/?p=1641>

crossings, often introduced as part of shared space design, have no official category thus accidents on them are not recorded as such making shared space accident data very unreliable.

An academic study that analysed the evidence base for the Department for Transport guidance (LTN 1/11 Shared Space) concluded that the claims made on behalf of shared space have overstated the available evidence. The study looked at a scheme in Ashford, Kent showing that most pedestrians diverted away from their desired lines, often giving way to vehicles and feeling safer under an original road layout.

The purpose of this research therefore is to find out more about peoples experiences of using shared spaces in towns and cities in order to establish a greater understanding of the impact of shared spaces on the public.

## Methodology

An online questionnaire was created using the web tool, Survey Monkey ([www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com)). The questionnaire contained both closed and open-ended questions and a copy can be found in Appendix 1. Between 26th March and 30<sup>th</sup> April 2015 the survey was open for data collection; it was available online and in other accessible formats. In total, 852 respondents took the survey with 614 fully completed questionnaires. The survey was publicised in various media, via local and specialist news organisations and was also distributed via websites, blogs, email and Twitter snowball sampling. This approach enabled a wide reaching and rapid connection to those who have used shared spaces in Britain.

## Establishing Experience

The first question in the survey was designed to establish whether the respondent had ever used a shared space. In total, 523 respondents selected yes and 91 selected no. Of those that ticked no, 82 per cent had never heard of shared spaces or stated that there were no shared spaces nearby. The remaining 18 per cent **actively avoided** shared spaces as they did not understand them or did not trust drivers to slow down. Those that ticked no to the screening question were then routed to the end of the survey.

## Sample Characteristics

The 523 respondents who answered yes to having used a shared space went on to answer further questions about their experience when using shared spaces. Of this sample the average age was 50, ranging between 12 to 87 years old. 55 per cent were male and 45 per cent female. 60 per cent recorded no impairment, 10 per cent ticked the blind or partial sight loss category and 12 per cent ticked multiple categories (see table 1). In order to analyse responses by geography the first three digits of the respondent's postcode was recoded into a regional classification. Formerly known as government office regions, the postcodes were classified into nine regions within England with Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland listed alongside for any UK-wide statistical comparisons. All regions and nations are represented in the sample but most respondents lived in the London and the West Midlands (25 and 24 per cent respectively). See table 2 for further information.



## **Results**

### **Location of shared spaces**

Respondents to the survey were asked to name the shared spaces that they have used. Over a hundred UK shared spaces were referenced by respondents and over 30 in London. See table 3 in Appendix 1 for the full list. Schemes in several European Countries were also mentioned.

### **Use of shared spaces**

Most respondents to the survey walked in shared spaces (61 per cent). Of the remaining sample, 12 per cent cycled and 24 per cent drove a vehicle (69 per cent of these were cars, 30 per cent were driving in a professional capacity: bus, van or lorry). The remainder of respondents were wheelchair users.

### **Experience of using shared spaces**

When asked to rate their experience of a shared space, 63 per cent of the sample rated it as poor, 19 per cent as fair and 18 per cent as good. This pattern of response was reflected across most choices of travel with 66 per cent and 64 per cent of drivers and pedestrians rating their experience as poor with nearly half of cyclists (48 per cent) reporting their experience as poor. Higher rates of poor experience were also seen for respondents regardless of gender (female 66 per cent; male 60 per cent) or whether they reported a long-standing condition or disability (disability 70 per cent; no disability 57 per cent).

## **Poor experience of shared spaces**

### **Pedestrians**

Pedestrians constantly reported feeling scared and unsafe, indeed a shocking 35 per cent said they “would go out of their way” to avoid a shared space. Pedestrians felt intimidated and bullied by cars and the issue of crossings is particularly problematic. People commented on poor visibility when trying to cross roads, often due to parked cars, and vehicles not stopping to allow them to cross. One respondent summed up the shared space they used as:

*“...lethally dangerous. In poor light or glare or shadow, drivers cannot see pedestrians. Disabled people and those with poor sight or mobility cannot protect themselves. The idea behind such spaces depends on every user being 100 per cent able and 100 per cent alert at all times, which just doesn't happen in real life. I consider this whole idea to be completely (and criminally) insane.”*

One blind user unable to access a local shared space independently said:

*“...for people with no sight like myself they are a death trap. I cannot express how terrible they are and how they make me feel so angry; to think all the people responsible for them expect us to use it when we cannot see. I use the one in Leek with my husband and never on my own.”*

### **Crossings:**

Pedestrians felt strongly in many areas that drivers did not recognise that an area was a shared space and were not slowing down to allow people to cross. Problems were pronounced in areas with high volumes of traffic or through traffic. For example in Hackbridge, Sutton, zebra crossings were removed from a busy (A) road and replaced with “courtesy crossings”. One person commenting on the Hackbridge scheme said they were now:

*“Unable to cross the roads to get to any of the shops. I'm limited to just Sainsbury's and can gaze in wonderment at all the revamped shops on the other side of the two roads.”*

Another local witnessed that:

*“Cars do not stop when you are at a crossing - they do not slow down - it is now more dangerous to cross the road and I have witnessed many more crashes and accidents with car collision because drivers do not know what to do when they approach these schemes and pedestrians are being told to walk out in front of a car to cross the road - it's crazy!”*

Hackbridge is a particularly telling example as just last week Sutton Council announced they are planning to reinstate zebra crossings.<sup>2</sup> The cost of this U-turn is not yet known but as more and more local authorities are forced into expensive remedial work, often restoring crossings they have themselves removed, the need for urgent action become even more apparent.

Pedestrian difficulty in crossing these roads or “spaces” was raised again and again:

*“As a pedestrian I find that drivers proceed as if it were a normal road without any thought for other users. I have had several near misses and have been hit once by a wing mirror”*

In spaces where the lanes are very narrow and traffic movements unclear one respondent reported a *“resulting tendency towards “might is right” rather than the spontaneous outbreak of courtesy which advocates presume. As a cyclist or pedestrian, you're never going to win a contest of might against a car or lorry, so it's just intimidating.”*

Another spoke of being unable to cross at a scheme in Stonehouse describing it as *“a completely failed shared space. It functions just like an averagely busy road. On my last visit I tried 3 times to cross the road and no vehicle stopped, even though I was waiting at the edge of the pavement. Each time I waited and counted at least 18 vehicles passing by, including a local bus, and none of them stopped.”*

Many respondents mentioned having to run across the road or feeling frightened that they wouldn't be fast enough.

---

<sup>2</sup>Hackbridge

[https://www.sutton.gov.uk/info/200264/streets\\_roads\\_and\\_highways\\_maintenance/1374/the\\_outer\\_london\\_fund/4](https://www.sutton.gov.uk/info/200264/streets_roads_and_highways_maintenance/1374/the_outer_london_fund/4)

*“People do not know it is a shared place as there are no signs to say it’s shared. Cars still go at a speed. I am older and need more time to cross.”*

Parents with children reported that they found shared spaces most difficult to navigate when with children, this is especially hard when schemes are introduced near schools:

*“It is unclear where cars are coming from or going to - a nightmare when crossing with children.”*

*“I didn't feel safe for/with children - there were no clear boundaries for them. Road traffic was still moving at 20mph or more, I had to make sure we held their hands the whole time. Motor traffic often failed to give way at ‘informal crossings’, and lack of pedestrian priority crossings meant you had to basically take your chances or wait a long time to cross the ‘road’ ”.*

Disappearing crossings were also unpopular with wheelchair users with one commenting that:

*“no demarcated crossing points make crossing the road/space more difficult”*

and another felt that other road users didn’t appreciate the challenges for wheelchair users:

*“Many other shared space users seem to think that wheelchairs have independently controlled brakes or that wheelchair users can power-move themselves out of potential dangerous situations.”*

Another problem frequently referred to was how stressful it is if traffic in one direction stops to allow you to cross but traffic from the other direction does not:

*“Because most vehicle drivers do not recognise shared space as a crossing for pedestrians, I found when a driver did stop for me to cross a lot of times the driver coming in the opposite direction did not stop and this meant standing in the middle of the road with nowhere to go, and sometimes being shouted at for being in the road. I therefore found it very dangerous and not a nice experience!”*

Blind and visually impaired respondents, whether guide dog owners or white cane users, found crossing impossible.

*“As I have a guide dog he finds it impossible to find the correct crossing points”*

Another respondent remarked that it was:

*“Frightening. Walking into a stream of moving traffic which I can’t see”.*

### **Kerbs:**

Lack of kerbing is a common element of shared space design known as level surface. This causes particular problems in terms of losing the sense of “safe” space. As one parent wrote:

*“When I was walking with my young children who were taught to walk on a pavement and stop at a curb I almost lost my young daughter who ran into the path of a large car which appeared not to moderate its speed to accommodate the shared space.”*

Many blind people use kerbs as an essential navigational tool. One man wrote about the:

*“Difficulty in navigating due to absence of any clear indicator such as a kerb. Feeling of insecurity. Wished that I wasn't there.”*

Another blind user with the same problem would not use the space alone:

*“I could not use the shared space safely as there was no definition of a kerb to tell me where the pavement started or ended. I would not be able to use them on my own.”*

A guide dog owner wrote that:

*“It was horrific as I couldn't work out where the safest place for me to walk was. I also needed to be on the other side of the space numerous times and more than once had a close shave with cars and cyclists.”*

Another:

*“I am blind. Not knowing the difference between the place where I'm safe and the bit where I can be killed is scary!”*

And yet another:

*“Feels unsafe, difficult to know where it is safe to be in the road and where it is not.”*

## **Materials:**

A few pedestrian respondents commented on the construction materials used in the shared space:

*“I find the paving material to be slippery especially after rainfall, plus the Hanley shared space in certain areas has a small raised kerb that you always have to look out for, thus not looking out for traffic. Because of the accidents on these raised kerbs (twisted ankles) they've now had to put little reflective disks in place, again making you concentrate on your footing not at traffic.”*

*“In Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent, the kerb and road have the same colour. I didn't see the drop and fell off it and broke my ankle!”*

While tactile surfaces were recognised as trying to aid the user, a number of respondents felt that they were not very effective:

*“Other shops and landmarks are much harder to find due to the wide pavement with trees in random places. While tactile paving is provided in some places, it is only right by the kerb forcing me to walk close to the traffic and on the kerb.”*

*“The main space I use is marked by a slightly different colour stone which, when moving in a (wheel) chair in pedestrian traffic, I often miss. I then end up on the road in front of cars that are not speed restricted so are travelling at 30 mph but have just moved off from a traffic light system so are accelerating. UK drivers are not in the correct mindset to use these shared spaces believing they should always have the right of way.”*

*“There is also no consideration as to the status of the shared space surfaces, often bricks, which when not level are a barrier to wheelchair.”*

*“I sometimes walk or I am in a wheel chair. It is horrendous and I hate it. When it first opened I got out of a taxi and was nearly run over as I was not aware it was a road. The layout is confusing and very scary, and I am embarrassed to ask for help using the space safely.”*

## Drivers

Car, lorry and bus drivers are equally exasperated with the shared spaces that they have to use and constantly referred to the schemes as “frightening”, “scary”, “dangerous” and “unsafe”. Drivers commented that raised crossing areas weren’t clearly marked making them difficult to see until the last minute; mini roundabouts caused confusion with cars nearly driving into the back of the next car and large pavements often infringed on the road layout making cars seem to swing into oncoming traffic. Positioning of parking spaces close to raised crossings and mini roundabouts made drivers aware that pedestrians had to walk between cars when trying to cross the roads which they felt was dangerous.

Drivers consistently reported being unsure of who had right of way in a shared space and although the intention of removing clear signals about who has right of way is to encourage courtesy the result actually seems to be confusion, chaos and constant near misses:

*“Pedestrians have no idea where they're going, and wander into the road or bus lanes. Cars have no idea where the bus lanes are. Roundabouts are unclear. Drivers from outside of the area are particularly dangerous - they drive at their normal town speed despite not understanding the layout. If the aim was to get cars to drive more carefully because of the lack of demarcation, it fails miserably - they drive at the same speed but more dangerously!”*

*“I hate using the shared space scheme because people are walking out in front of my lorry; there are no warning signs saying that pedestrians may be crossing. As the shared space has traffic lights it is not known if the pedestrians have access when the light is green. It is total confusion. Heavy goods vehicles are being directed through the shared space area pushing more traffic through this area.”*

And sadly often generating rage rather than consideration:

*“I absolutely HATE driving through it. I understand the concept is to make drivers more aware of their surroundings and thus improve their awareness of pedestrians, other vehicles, etc however I drive through it and my tension levels increase, I become stressed and rather angry on occasion, I find myself muttering about moronic town planners, and going through the shared space zone just generally*

*makes my stress levels sky rocket and actually it's the only time when driving that I feel anything close to road rage when some other road user acts in an unexpected way HONESTLY, THE PAVEMENT IS FOR PEDESTRIANS, THE ROAD IS FOR CARS."*

Drivers experienced the stress of being responsible for causing the situations in which pedestrians described a feeling of 'getting trapped' in the middle of the road:

*"Should I stop for pedestrians? If I stop will someone else expect me to have kept moving, or worse, carry on and hit a pedestrian?"*

*"If as a driver you stop to let pedestrians across you are often abused by other drivers. I stop, but the cars coming the other way don't, so pedestrians don't know whether to cross or not or they cross and then have to run. Elderly and disabled are too scared to cross as they can't move fast enough."*

Most drivers reported an increase in near misses:

*"On several occasions I have nearly run over kamikaze pedestrians jumping out on front of me. Do they have right of way? Am I supposed to stop? Who knows as there are no signs. What a ridiculous idea!"*

One bus driver reported that:

*"Pedestrians do not look for traffic, I've nearly had about 100 accidents so far."*

Once again, concern about the safety of children was paramount:

*"As a driver, I was on pins. It only takes an unruly child to run from its parent for a potential fatality."*

*"We spent years and loads of money teaching our children to stop, look and listen, now they will have to stop, hope and pray."*

Congestion caused by the layout of the shared spaces often led to drivers taking short cuts, for example, choosing to drive on the pavement to avoid traffic jams:

*"Confusing - every vehicle slowed to a crawl as no indications of right of way - eventually I treat it as a mandate to drive on the pavement."*

However, conversely drivers also took the opportunity to take a route through a shared space in order to avoid traffic lights and other street furniture to speed up



their journey with several respondents reporting that they try to avoid shared space 'at all costs'.

## **Cyclists**

Those who cycled in shared spaces yet again described their experience as dangerous, saying that they felt unsafe and intimidated, particularly when cars arrived at speed into shared spaces from faster A roads. The majority of cyclists reported that in the schemes they used cars still travelled at speed and dominated the road. Cyclists often felt that shared space offered the worst of both worlds – *“sharing on roads meant asserting themselves against cars”*, often forced into blind spots and in danger of collisions and when *“sharing space with pedestrians they had to slow down to pedestrian speeds and risk upsetting and colliding with pedestrians. Segregating doesn't sound as friendly or nice as sharing but clearly for cyclists separate defined cycle paths would offer a much safer and more comfortable solution”*.

One cyclist summed the situation up as:

*“Good for nobody. It's dangerous to share with cars due to driver lack of patience and courtesy. Sharing with pedestrians is confusing for everyone, usually unmarked, slow, annoying for all users.”*

Sharing with cars:

*“Shared space makes no difference to vehicle speeds, vehicles still pass close by and the shared space experience puts you more on edge as both a pedestrian and cyclist, as you are not sure how drivers will behave. It is an unpleasant experience whether on foot or on a bike.”*

*“Exhibition Road still feels largely dominated by motor vehicles; cyclists are still restricted to pavements. By being a junction, Paul Street feels unsafe. I can appreciate that the design is made for users to engage with their surroundings and therefore be safer, but as a cyclist the shared space has made me particularly anxious because of the danger of collision with cars and the lack of spatial awareness among pedestrians.”*

*“Drivers were aggressive and due to the lack of defined space for cycling attempt to bully cyclists into where pedestrians were right at the edge. Motorists were traveling fast and at junctions with no defined priority used size and power to bully other to give way even if other was already in junction.”*

*“Shared space is a false promise with poor delivery ... ‘sharing’ is NEVER on equal terms - as a confident but anxious cyclist, I usually “win” the sharing “transactions”, but if a particular driver doesn't want to yield, they won't. These junctions are entirely unsuitable for cyclists who are not confident, thus they protect the strong not the weak. In Coventry, zebra crossings have been put back very rapidly, but many junctions still do not have them. Pedestrians almost NEVER have priority at “shared space” junctions. They are a ridiculous waste of public money.”*

Sharing with pedestrians:

*“It's horrible to share space with pedestrians. You want to get to where you're going, ideally that would involve having a nice, segregated space where you only share with other bikes, which tend to travel in a very predictable speed and direction in single file. Pedestrians tend to travel in groups (often across the entire width of the shared space), slowly and erratically, and with children or dogs who might dart in front of you. Obviously you don't want to be aggressive, intimidating, or dangerous. So you are constantly coming up on groups of pedestrians with their backs to you, slowing to walking pace, ringing your bell or shouting EXCUSE ME SORRY CAN I GET PAST YOU THERE SORRY THANKS SORRY and then squeezing past awkwardly. This makes the whole experience very stressful and not much fun for the pedestrians either.”*

The design of the shared space also created problems where tactile paving was used as cyclists reported it to be difficult to cycle on. That combined with lack of signage, roundabouts being hard to see, and obstacles in the way such as street furniture made it a difficult environment to navigate with a bicycle.

### **Good and Fair experience of shared spaces**

The small proportion of respondents (18 per cent) who reported having a good experience attributed this to a more attractive environment and vehicle traffic

travelling at slower speeds. Several of the schemes in which good experience was reported were from outside the UK. In the UK no one scheme stood out in this response group but in general respondents felt schemes often used high quality building materials which created a pleasant ambience. Often in these areas respondents noted that vehicle traffic was restricted to slow speeds and kept to a minimum through designated times for vehicle access and, when traffic was allowed, was often one way. However, when traffic was allowed to use the area freely, respondents often felt that their experience deteriorated.

### **General opinion of shared spaces**

When asked, which of the following is closest to your view of shared spaces a total of 35 per cent reported going out of their way to avoid them with a further 45 per cent of respondents answering that they were cautious of them. 13 per cent reported liking shared spaces, and 7 per cent reported having no concerns.

### **Accidents in shared spaces**

In total 28 respondents to the survey had been involved in an accident in a shared space, 11 of which had been involved in more than one accident. Only three of these incidents were reported to the police, with a further one reported to the local council. Accidents included pedestrians being hit by vehicles and bicycles, cyclists being hit by cars and people stumbling on ridged surfaces:

*“I stepped out in front of a car which knocked me to the ground with its front left corner. The driver did not stop.”*

*“A car approaching from my left hit my left hand with its mirror. While this was a gentle collision that didn't cause me injury I don't expect to have to run the gauntlet of moving traffic in order to do a little shopping.”*

## **Conclusion**

Regardless of their mode of transport, disability status or gender, this survey found an overwhelming majority of respondents did not enjoy using shared spaces. This survey also found a third of respondents go out of their way to actively avoid shared space schemes. Respondents who did use them described feeling intimidated, anxious and frightened, not only for their own safety, but also for the safety of others. If the stated intention of shared space is to “improve pedestrian movement and comfort” and “enabling all users to share the space” (DfT 2011) the predominantly negative feelings towards such vast number and varied assortment of shared spaces across Britain raises significant questions about how well local authorities are designing and evaluating the impact of these urban designs on their users.

The pattern of non-reporting of accidents to the police seen in our survey, with very few respondents (11 per cent) reporting incidents, calls into question the validity of a) the methodology recommended by the DfT on how to monitor operational safety of a shared space and b) previous evaluations of shared space using road accident statistics if this under-reporting has not been taken into account.

Taken together the results of this survey show that there is an urgent need for an immediate moratorium on shared space until there is more and better evidence about the impact of shared space schemes including an improved (central) record of accident data and a better understanding of the consequences of people literally designed out of these spaces.

## References

Department for Transport (2011). Local Transport Note 1/11. Shared Space.  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/3873/lt\\_n-1-11.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/3873/lt_n-1-11.pdf)

Department for Transport (2014), Reported Road Casualties in Great Britain: Quarterly Provisional Estimates Q2 2014 Statistical Release 6 November 2014.  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/370826/quarterly-estimates-apr-to-jun-2014.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/370826/quarterly-estimates-apr-to-jun-2014.pdf)

Moody, S. and Melia, S. (2014) Shared space: Research, policy and problems. Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Transport, 167 (6), pp. 384-392.

## Appendix 1. Tables

Table 1: Respondent conditions which have lasted, or are expected to last, at least 12 months

<b>Disability</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
Deafness or partial hearing loss	26	5
Blindness or partial sight loss	51	10
Learning disability	0	0
Learning difficulty	2	0
Developmental disorder	1	0
Physical disability	19	4
Mental health condition	12	2
Long-term illness, disease or condition	29	6
No condition	315	60
Multiple	63	12
Other	5	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 2: Location of respondents by region

<b>Region</b>	<b>Number of respondents</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
North West	40	8
North East	8	1.5
Yorkshire and Humber	10	2
East Midlands	26	5
West Midlands	127	24
East of England	65	12
London	131	25
South East	21	4
South West	40	8
Scotland	26	5
Wales	9	2
Northern Ireland	1	0
Missing	19	3.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 3: Locations reported in survey

Aberdeen	Green Area, Old Merchant Quarter and Cults
Altrincham	Town Centre
Aldridge	
Arbroath	
Ashford	Ring Road, Bank Street and Elwick Road
Ashton-under-Lyne	
Aylesbury	Friarage Road / Bourg Walk

Ayr	Dunure Road
Bath	Julian Road
Barnstaple	Around Old Bus Station, The Strand
North Berwick	
Birmingham	John Bright Street. Longbridge
Blackpool	Promenade & Central Business District
Bolton	
Bournemouth	Boscombe. Horseshoe Common
Bradford	
Bradford upon Avon	Town Centre
Bridlington	Promenade (Victor from Leeds told me)
Brighton	New Road
Bristol	Ashton Court
Buckden	Lucks Lane
Buntingford	Across the town
Bury	The Haymarket
Bury St Edmunds	St Andrew's Street South
Cardiff	
Carmarthen	King's Street
Cambridge	Fitzroy Street
Cheltenham	Boots Corner
Chester	Little John Street
Church Crookham	
Cirencester	Market Place
Chorley	
Coventry	Little Park Street, Corporation Street, Junction of Trinity Street and Hales Street, Cox Street



Crewe	
Derby	Downham, Bromley Road
Dunstable	Court Drive
Durham	Market Square. Saddler Street
Dundee	
Eastbourne	
Ely	Market Place
Edinburgh	Granton
Exeter	
Felixstowe	Town Centre
Gateshead	
Glasgow	
Gloucester	Stonehouse. Southgate Street/Commercial Way. Kimbrose Way
Grimsby	Town Centre
Hasting	
Hamilton	
Hazel Grove	
Hereford	Wildemarsh Street
Hull	Jamieson Street, King Edward's Street. Whitefriargate. Victoria Square
Isle of Man	Douglas Promenade
Keighley	
Keswick	
Kilmarnock	Town wide integrated urban development plan
Kingston upon Thames	Near the Guildhall
Kinross	High Street
Kirkintulloch	Town Centre

Leeds	Briggate
Leek	Ballhaye Street.
Leicester	Jubilee Square. High Street. St Nicholas Circle. The Parade. Oadby
Leigh on Sea	The Broadway
Letchworth Garden City	
Lewes	The Cliffe
Lowestoft	Gordon Road & Milton Road East
Lichfield	
Maidstone	
Manchester	Chapel Street
Market Harborough	Fardon Road
Milton Keynes	
Middlesborough	
Newbury	Town Centre
Newcastle	Near Grainger Market
Newcastle under Lyme	
Nottingham	Ironmarket. Broad Street. Heathcoate Street. Carlton Street. Goose Gate. Pelham Street Beeston.
Norwich	Pottergate. Queens Street
Orpington	Paddock Wood
Oxford	Queen Street
Plymouth	Ker Street
Pitlochry	
Pontypridd	Town centre
Poynton	Fountain Place, London Road, Chester Road & Park Lane
Preston	Fishergate
Portsmouth	South of Palmerston Road

Poundbury	Queen Mother Square
Reading	Town centre
Sevenoaks	Sevenoaks Station
Sidcup	
Sheffield	
Shifnal	All town
Shropshire	
Shoreham-by-Sea	
Shrewsbury	
Solihull	
Southend on Sea	
Stoke on Trent	Hanley. Basford Bank. Albion Street. Stafford Street
Stirling	
Shaftesbury	
Stratford upon Avon	
Swadlincote	
Swansea	
Swindon	Regent Circus
Taunton	
Totnes	High Street
Tunbridge Wells	
Torquay	
Walsall	
Warwick	High street
West Bromwich	
Weston Super Mare	
Whitehaven	Stand Street, East Strand, Market Place junction

Winchester	High Street
Worcester	
Wycombe	
York	
London	Acton, King Street
London	Bedford Square
London	Belvedere Road, SE1
London	Bexley Heath
London	Byng Place, N1
London	Covent Garden
London	Earls Court Road
London	Exhibition Road
London	Fitzroy Square
London	Hackbridge
London	Highbury and Islington
London	High Hill Ferry Lea Navigation
London	Islington
London	Judd Street
London	Kings Cross Station
London	Kings Road
London	Leonard Street
London	Lucks Lane
London	Lower Marsh
London	New Street Square, EC4
London	Pinner Hill Estate
London	Plumstead

London	Rivington Street
London	St Johns Road, SW11
London	Seven Dials
London	Sloane Square
London	Strutton Ground
London	Torrington Place
London	Twickenham
London	Pinner Hill Estate
London	Walthamstow
London	West Ealing
London	Whitton
London	Whipps Cross Road
London	Venn Street

## Appendix 2. Questionnaire

1. A shared space is a street or area where people and traffic are not clearly separated. The area might have level surfaces, no pavements and kerbs and road crossings without traffic signals or zebra markings.

Thinking of the description above, have you ever used a shared space?

Yes (GO TO QU 5)

No (GO TO QU 2)

Don't know (END)

2. Why have you never used a shared space?

There aren't any near me (END)

I've never heard of a shared space (END)

I'm reluctant to use them (GO TO QU 4)

I avoid them (GO TO QU 4)

Other (GO TO QU 3)

3. Please describe (END)

4. Why is this? (END)

5. Where is this shared space? Please list them all if you have used more than one.  
(GO TO QU 6)

6. Thinking of the shared space that you use most often, were you mainly....

Walking (GO TO QU 9)

Cycling (GO TO QU 9)

Driving (GO TO QU 7)

Other (GO TO QU 8)

7. What kind of vehicle were you driving?

Car (GO TO QU 9)

Bus (GO TO QU 9)

Van or lorry (GO TO QU 9)

Motorbike or moped (GO TO QU 9)

Mobility scooter (GO TO QU 9)

Other (GO TO QU 8)

8. Please describe (GO TO QU 9)

9. In general, how would you rate your experience of the shared space that you most frequently use?

Good (GO TO QU 10)

Fair (GO TO QU 11)

Poor (GO TO QU 12)

10. Why was your experience good? (GO TO QU 13)

11. Why was your experience fair? (GO TO QU 13)

12. Why was your experience poor? (GO TO QU 13)

13. Have you ever been involved in an accident in a shared space?

Yes, on more than one occasion (GO TO QU 14)

Yes, only once (GO TO QU 14)

No (GO TO QU 16)

14. Did you report the incident?

Yes (GO TO QU 15)

No (GO TO QU 17)

15. Who did you report the accident too? (GO TO QU 16)

16. Can you tell us more about the accident? (GO TO QU 17)

17. Which of the following is closest to your view of shared spaces?

I like them (GO TO QU 18)

I have no concerns about using them (GO TO QU 18)

I am cautious of them (GO TO QU 18)

I would go out of my way to avoid them (GO TO QU 18)

18. Why is this? (GO TO QU 19)

19. Are you...

Male (GO TO QU 20)

Female (GO TO QU 20)

20. What is your age? (GO TO QU 21)



21. Do you have any of the following conditions which have lasted, or are expected to last, at least 12 months? (GO TO QU 22)

Tick all that apply

Deafness or partial hearing loss

Blindness or partial sight loss

Learning disability (for example Down's Syndrome)

Learning difficulty (for example dyslexia)

Developmental disorder (for example, Autistic Spectrum Disorder)

Physical disability

Mental health condition

Long-term illness, disease or condition

No condition

22. Finally, for analysis purposes, please can you give the first part of your postcode?