

Welcoming Roads

Multi-Level Implementation Strategy

**Coordinating System-Wide
Evidence-Based Road Safety Policy
Across Government**

September 2025

The Motorcycle Action Group

Authored by: Colin Brown



MAG
Motorcycle Action Group

Executive Summary

Welcoming Roads' effectiveness depends on coordinated system-wide implementation across multiple levels of government, applying evidence-based principles uniformly to all road user groups. This paper provides practical mechanisms for achieving comprehensive policy coherence without undermining democratic accountability or constitutional boundaries.

Critical Implementation Requirement:

Welcoming Roads operates as an integrated system where evidence-based principles must apply equally to all road user groups - pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists, and other motor vehicle users. Selective application to individual road user categories while maintaining alternative policy frameworks for others fundamentally undermines the systematic methodology essential for effectiveness and creates the very inconsistency that evidence-based approaches are designed to eliminate.

The systematic approach requires coordinated replacement of existing frameworks with evidence-based methodology across all road user policies. Partial philosophical adoption - such as applying Welcoming Roads to motorcycles while maintaining Vision Zero hierarchical approaches for other road users - defeats the core purpose by fragmenting the evidence base and missing the interaction effects that create cumulative safety benefits.

This implementation strategy addresses the system-wide coordination challenge through proven governance mechanisms that respect democratic accountability while enabling the comprehensive approach essential for evidence-based road safety policy effectiveness.

The System-Wide Implementation Challenge

Why Uniform Principles Matter

Welcoming Roads operates as an integrated approach where evidence-based principles applied consistently across all road user groups create cumulative safety benefits that exceed the sum of individual interventions. This system-wide effectiveness depends on several critical factors:

Unified Evidence Base: Road safety interventions affect multiple road user types simultaneously. Driver education that addresses "failed to observe and risk assess properly" reduces casualties for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorcyclists concurrently. Fragmenting approaches by road user type prevents proper evaluation of intervention effectiveness and obscures causal relationships.

Consistent Risk Assessment Framework: The Speed-Surprise-Space-Consequence model provides systematic risk assessment methodology applicable to all road users. When some road users operate under evidence-based frameworks while others remain subject to hierarchical approaches, it creates conflicting messages about responsibility and undermines the personal accountability essential for effective safety behavior.

Policy Interaction Effects: Infrastructure design decisions affect all road users simultaneously. Junction improvements that enhance motorcycle safety through better sight lines also benefit pedestrians and cyclists. Fragmenting design philosophy by road user type creates competing requirements that prevent optimal solutions.

Public Understanding and Compliance: Consistent evidence-based messaging across all road user groups builds public confidence and understanding. When different road users receive contradictory messages about responsibility, risk assessment, and safety approaches, it undermines the collaborative behavior essential for shared road space effectiveness.

The Selective Implementation Challenge

Learning from Early Adoption Experience: Oxfordshire County Council's 2024 Vision Zero Strategy acknowledges Welcoming Roads methodology for motorcycle safety applications while maintaining Vision Zero hierarchical frameworks for other road users. This initial adoption demonstrates both the political feasibility of evidence-based approaches and the practical limitations of selective implementation that highlight why comprehensive coordination becomes necessary.

Early Implementation Challenges: Selective application of evidence-based principles to individual road user groups while maintaining alternative frameworks for others creates several coordination difficulties:

Methodological Inconsistency: Applying evidence-based principles to motorcyclists while maintaining "hierarchy of road users" approaches for pedestrians and cyclists creates internal policy tensions that limit the effectiveness of both frameworks and prevent systematic evaluation of outcomes.

Evidence Base Fragmentation: When motorcycle safety interventions operate under Welcoming Roads principles while pedestrian and cyclist interventions follow Vision Zero approaches, it becomes difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of either methodology systematically or capture the interaction effects between different road user groups.

Coordination Complexities: Enhanced driver awareness that prevents "failed to observe" motorcycle casualties also reduces pedestrian and cyclist casualties - but these system-wide benefits cannot be fully realized or measured when different road user policies operate under different frameworks.

Implementation Learning: Early selective adoption experiences suggest that partial implementation inevitably reveals why systematic coordination across all road user groups delivers superior outcomes for comprehensive safety improvement.

Constitutional and Democratic Framework

The UK's multi-level governance system provides different authorities with distinct responsibilities for different aspects of road safety policy. System-wide coordination must work within these structures while ensuring consistent evidence-based principles across all road user groups.

National Government (DfT, DVLA, National Highways):

- System-wide policy framework setting applying evidence-based principles to all road user groups
- Unified licensing and vehicle standards regulation across all vehicle categories
- Integrated infrastructure standards (DMRB) considering all road users systematically
- Coordinated campaign messaging avoiding contradictory approaches between road user groups
- Inter-governmental coordination ensuring consistent approaches across devolved administrations

Regional/Combined Authorities (where established):

- Strategic transport planning integrating evidence-based approaches for all road users
- System-wide funding coordination and allocation

-
- Cross-boundary infrastructure projects applying unified design principles
 - Regional network management ensuring consistent approaches across authority boundaries

Local Authorities (including London Boroughs):

- Integrated local traffic management applying evidence-based principles across all road user groups
- Coordinated infrastructure implementation using unified design standards
- System-wide community engagement avoiding divisive messaging between road user groups
- Unified planning and development control applying consistent principles

Devolved Administrations (Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland):

- System-wide transport policy development within devolved competencies
- Coordinated approaches with UK Government ensuring consistent principles across reserved and devolved matters
- Regional strategic planning applying evidence-based methodology uniformly

System-Wide Coordination Mechanisms

1. Unified Evidence-Based Policy Framework

Principle:

Replace existing fragmented approaches with systematic evidence-based methodology applying consistent principles to all road user groups rather than selective application to individual categories.

Implementation Requirements:

Comprehensive Approach:

Authorities adopting Welcoming Roads must apply evidence-based principles system-wide rather than selectively. Partial philosophical adoption creates policy contradictions that undermine effectiveness.

Road User Integration:

Policy development must consider all road user groups simultaneously using unified frameworks rather than separate consultations and decision-making processes for different user types.

Evidence Base Unity:

Casualty analysis, intervention evaluation, and outcome measurement must integrate all road user types using consistent methodologies rather than fragmented approaches by user group.

Application Examples:

Infrastructure Design Standards:

- Unified design assessment considering pedestrian, cyclist, motorcycle, and other motor vehicle needs simultaneously
- Integrated conflict resolution protocols when user group needs compete for limited road space
- System-wide design review processes ensuring all user groups benefit from evidence-based approaches rather than hierarchical trade-offs

Education and Training Integration:

- Driver education addressing awareness and detection of all vulnerable road users using consistent risk assessment methodology
- Cyclist training incorporating awareness of motorcycle and pedestrian interaction using Speed-Surprise-Space-Consequence principles
- Pedestrian education using same risk assessment framework applied to other road user groups

Enforcement Approaches:

- Consistent evidence-based enforcement focusing on behaviors that create risk for all road user groups
- Unified messaging avoiding divisive campaigns that pit different road user types against each other
- Integrated penalty structures reflecting actual risk levels rather than hierarchical assumptions about responsibility

2. Default Policy Framework with System-Wide Evidence-Based Override

Principle:

Establish Welcoming Roads principles as default approaches for all road user policies with clear, evidence-based criteria for local variation rather than selective application by user group.

Application Examples:

Integrated Access Policies:

- Default presumption: Evidence-based access policies for all appropriate vehicle types unless specific safety evidence demonstrates risk
- Unified override criteria: Published casualty data affecting any road user group that demonstrates increased risk from policy changes
- System-wide review mechanism: Annual assessment of all access restrictions with requirement to remove barriers where evidence no longer supports exclusion
- Comprehensive consultation: Stakeholder engagement including all affected road user groups before implementing restrictions

Speed Management Integration:

- Default framework: Evidence-based speed limit setting considering safety outcomes for all road user groups simultaneously
- Unified variation criteria: Local modifications permitted where casualty data or road design characteristics support changes benefiting overall safety rather than individual user groups
- Transparent justification: Published evidence base covering impacts on all road user groups rather than selective analysis

Campaign Coordination:

- Default approach: Evidence-based messaging promoting mutual respect and shared responsibility across all road user groups
- Override criteria: Alternative approaches permitted only where evidence demonstrates superior safety outcomes for all user groups
- Consistent messaging: Avoid campaigns that promote divisive attitudes between different road user types

3. Financial Incentive Coordination for System-Wide Implementation

Comprehensive Adoption Requirements:

- Link major transport funding to demonstration of system-wide evidence-based approaches rather than selective implementation by user group
- Prioritise authorities demonstrating unified approaches over those applying Welcoming Roads selectively
- Create funding streams that reward comprehensive philosophical adoption rather than piecemeal policy changes

Performance Metrics Integration:

- Establish funding criteria requiring casualty reduction across all road user groups using consistent methodologies
- Create bonus allocations for authorities demonstrating system-wide stakeholder engagement rather than fragmented consultation
- Link infrastructure funding to integrated design approaches benefiting all road user groups simultaneously

Cross-User Group Funding Coordination:

- Prevent funding silos that enable selective implementation by requiring integrated approaches for major project funding
- Establish evaluation criteria measuring benefits across all road user groups rather than individual user categories
- Create innovation funds supporting system-wide pilot programmes rather than single-issue interventions

4. Professional Standards and Unified Best Practice Networks

System-Wide Professional Development:

- Work with professional bodies to embed Welcoming Roads principles across all transport planning and highway engineering disciplines rather than specialist applications
- Develop integrated continuing professional development covering evidence-based approaches for all road user groups simultaneously
- Create professional accreditation schemes recognising system-wide competence rather than user-group-specific specialisation

Integrated Peer Learning Networks:

- Establish networks focused on comprehensive implementation approaches rather than selective applications
- Create partnerships between authorities demonstrating system-wide success rather than those with fragmented approaches
- Develop case study databases documenting unified policy development rather than single-issue interventions

Unified Technical Advisory Services:

- Provide support for system-wide evidence-based policy development rather than user-group-specific guidance
- Develop template approaches enabling consistent system-wide implementation rather than selective adoption
- Create evaluation frameworks measuring comprehensive effectiveness rather than fragmented outcomes by user group

Addressing Selective Implementation Risks

1. Preventing Philosophical Fragmentation

Clear Implementation Criteria:

Authorities seeking to adopt Welcoming Roads must demonstrate commitment to system-wide application rather than selective use for individual road user groups.

Evaluation Framework:

Assessment of Welcoming Roads adoption must measure system-wide consistency rather than accepting partial implementation as adequate progress.

Stakeholder Coordination:

Implementation support should require engagement with all road user group representatives simultaneously rather than separate consultations that enable selective adoption.

2. Avoiding the "Special Interest" Perception

Universal Benefit Messaging:

Emphasise that system-wide evidence-based approaches benefit all road users rather than promoting Welcoming Roads as motorcycle-specific advocacy that happens to use different principles.

Cross-User Group Evidence:

Demonstrate how evidence-based approaches deliver safety improvements across all road user categories rather than focusing on single-group benefits.

Integrated Policy Development:

Present Welcoming Roads as comprehensive transport policy reform rather than addition to existing frameworks covering other road users.

3. Building System-Wide Stakeholder Consensus

Multi-Group Engagement:

Require stakeholder processes involving all road user groups simultaneously rather than separate consultations that enable selective implementation.

Unified Advocacy:

Build coalitions supporting system-wide evidence-based approaches rather than single-issue campaigns that can be marginalized.

Cross-Benefit Demonstration:

Show how evidence-based approaches create benefits across road user groups rather than zero-sum competition between different users.

Sectoral Implementation Strategies

1. London System-Wide Coordination Through TfL Leadership

TfL's Strategic Role: Transport for London's influence across London's transport network positions it to drive system-wide coordination rather than user-group-specific interventions.

Comprehensive Implementation Approach:

- Use Local Implementation Programme funding to incentivise borough adoption of evidence-based principles across all road user groups rather than selective applications
- Establish integrated coordination mechanisms addressing all transport modes simultaneously rather than separate processes by user type
- Create technical advisory services supporting comprehensive policy development rather than user-group-specific guidance

System-Wide Implementation Phases:

- Phase 1: Establish integrated coordination frameworks requiring system-wide approach rather than selective adoption
- Phase 2: Use funding mechanisms to incentivise comprehensive philosophical adoption rather than piecemeal policy changes
- Phase 3: Share London's system-wide experience to inform national policy development rather than user-group-specific lessons

2. National Highway Network System-Wide Consistency

Integrated Strategic Route Management: Use National Highways' network management role to ensure consistent evidence-based approaches for all road users along strategic corridors rather than user-group-specific interventions.

System-Wide Implementation Elements:

- Establish design standards ensuring integrated safety infrastructure benefiting all road user groups rather than separate provisions by user type
- Coordinate with local authorities on comprehensive junction treatments rather than user-group-specific improvements
- Create corridor management approaches ensuring consistent system-wide policy implementation rather than fragmented approaches

3. Regional System-Wide Coordination Models

Comprehensive Authority Leadership: Where combined authorities exist, use strategic planning role to coordinate system-wide Welcoming Roads implementation rather than selective applications across constituent authorities.

Integrated Regional Networks: In areas without combined authorities, create voluntary regional networks enabling system-wide coordination rather than user-group-specific collaboration.

Democratic and Constitutional Considerations for System-Wide Implementation

Respecting Local Democratic Accountability While Ensuring **Comprehensive Approaches**

Democratic Choice Within System-Wide Framework: Enable local democratic representatives to retain decision-making authority over local implementation details while requiring comprehensive approach to evidence-based principles across all road user groups.

Enhanced Consultation for System-Wide Benefits: Strengthen local consultation processes by requiring integrated engagement with all road user groups simultaneously rather than separate consultations that enable selective implementation.

Comprehensive Evidence-Based Decision-Making: Provide local democratic processes with system-wide evidence about policy effectiveness across all road user groups rather than user-group-specific information that enables fragmented approaches.

Constitutional Boundary Management for Unified Implementation

System-Wide Policy Coordination: Create coordination mechanisms respecting devolved competencies while ensuring consistent evidence-based principles across all road user groups rather than fragmented approaches by jurisdiction.

Integrated Inter-Governmental Cooperation: Use existing machinery to coordinate comprehensive policy development rather than user-group-specific collaboration that enables selective implementation.

Voluntary System-Wide Coordination: Present comprehensive coordination mechanisms as opportunities for unified evidence-based working rather than selective adoption of preferred elements.

Implementation Timeline and Sequencing for System-Wide Adoption

Phase 1: System-Wide Foundation Setting (Year 1)

- Establish integrated coordination frameworks requiring comprehensive approach across all road user groups
- Create system-wide technical advisory services rather than user-group-specific support
- Develop unified performance measurement systems rather than fragmented assessment by user type
- Launch comprehensive pilot coordination programmes rather than selective implementations

Phase 2: Unified Incentive Implementation (Year 2)

- Align funding mechanisms with system-wide coordination objectives rather than user-group-specific targets
- Establish integrated professional development services rather than specialist training by user group
- Create comprehensive demonstration projects showing system-wide benefits rather than selective improvements
- Develop unified implementation toolkits rather than user-group-specific guidance

Phase 3: System-Wide Scaling and Evaluation (Years 3-5)

- Expand comprehensive coordination mechanisms rather than selective applications based on pilot evidence
- Evaluate system-wide coordination effectiveness rather than fragmented assessment by user group
- Share UK's integrated experience internationally rather than user-group-specific lessons
- Establish system-wide monitoring and continuous improvement rather than fragmented evaluation systems

Success Measurement for System-Wide Implementation

Primary System-Wide Coordination Indicators

- Percentage of authorities implementing comprehensive Welcoming Roads principles across all road user groups rather than selective applications
- Consistency of integrated policy approaches along transport corridors rather than user-group-specific variations
- Quality of system-wide evidence in policy justifications rather than fragmented analysis by user type
- Stakeholder satisfaction with unified coordination processes rather than separate user-group consultations

Comprehensive Outcome Indicators

- Casualty reduction rates across all road user groups in coordinated implementation areas rather than selective improvements by user type
- Public confidence in integrated transport policy rather than fragmented approaches by user group
- Professional satisfaction with system-wide coordination rather than user-group-specific processes
- Democratic representative satisfaction with comprehensive evidence-based decision-making support rather than fragmented information

System-Wide Process Indicators

- Effectiveness of funding mechanisms in incentivising comprehensive coordination rather than selective adoption
- Quality of integrated peer learning networks rather than user-group-specific knowledge transfer
- Speed of system-wide best practice adoption rather than selective implementation by user type
- Stakeholder engagement effectiveness in unified coordination processes rather than fragmented consultation

Risk Management for System-Wide Implementation

Implementation Risks

- Authority resistance to comprehensive coordination perceived as constraining user-group-specific flexibility
- Resource constraints limiting participation in system-wide rather than selective coordination mechanisms
- Political pressure for user-group-specific approaches rather than integrated policy development
- Stakeholder preference for familiar fragmented approaches rather than comprehensive coordination

Mitigation Strategies

- Emphasise democratic accountability preservation within comprehensive frameworks rather than user-group-specific constraints
- Provide adequate support for system-wide coordination rather than expecting authorities to manage fragmented approaches
- Build cross-party support through integrated evidence-based benefits rather than user-group-specific advocacy
- Demonstrate superior outcomes from comprehensive approaches rather than assuming stakeholder acceptance of system-wide coordination

Conclusion

Effective Welcoming Roads implementation requires system-wide coordination mechanisms applying evidence-based principles uniformly to all road user groups rather than selective application to preferred categories. Partial philosophical adoption - such as the Oxfordshire model applying Welcoming Roads methodology to motorcycles while maintaining Vision Zero hierarchies for other road users - fundamentally undermines the systematic approach essential for evidence-based policy effectiveness.

The proposed implementation strategy provides practical mechanisms for achieving comprehensive policy coherence through incentives, professional development, and peer learning that require system-wide adoption rather than permitting selective implementation. Success depends on presenting Welcoming Roads as integrated transport policy reform benefiting all road users rather than specialist approach for particular user groups.

Authorities must choose between comprehensive evidence-based approaches applied consistently across all road user groups or continuation of existing fragmented approaches. Selective adoption creates policy contradictions that undermine both Welcoming Roads effectiveness and existing framework coherence, delivering inferior outcomes for all road users while preventing proper evaluation of alternative approaches.

The Motorcycle Action Group stands ready to support comprehensive system-wide implementation of evidence-based coordination strategy and work constructively with authorities at all levels to achieve systematic adoption of integrated approaches that can deliver safer roads for all UK citizens regardless of their chosen mode of transport.

Contact Information

The Motorcycle Action Group

Email: central-office@mag-uk.org

Phone: 03300 560 886