



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**

**Report of the 20 mph Speed Limits/Zones Scrutiny
Panel**

May 2010

**SPEED REDUCTION REVIEW:
An Investigation into 20 mph speed limits/zones**

Draft report v 2

Volume Two: The Evidence

Panel Members:

Councillor Pete West (Chairman)
Councillor Jayne Bennett
Councillor Gill Mitchell
Councillor David Watkins
Councillor Geoffrey Wells

Contents:

- 1. Panel's scoping paper** **page 3-18**
- 2. Minutes of panel's scoping meeting** **page 19-24**
- 3. Minutes of panel's public meetings:**
 - a. 9/01/2010** **page 25-35**
 - b. 26/01/2010** **page 36-49**
 - c. 11/02/2010** **page 50-64**
 - d. 23/11/2010** **page 65-85**
- 4. Supporting evidence for minutes:**
 - a. Environmental Health: Presentation, 19/01/2010** **page 86-88**
 - b. UK Noise Association: Presentation, 19/01/2010** **page 89-90**
 - c. Living Streets: Presentation, 26/01/2010** **page 91-95**
 - d. Road Safety Team: Briefing note, 26/01/2010** **page 96-103**
 - e. Bricylces: Letter, 29/01/2010** **page 104-107**
- 5. Summary of those who gave evidence** **page 108-109**
- 6. Selection of Written Evidence:**
 - a. Public Health, 12/02/2010** **page 110-120**
 - b. Rospa, received, 25/03/201** **page 121-130**
 - c. ESFRS, 08/02/2010** **page 131**
 - d. SEC Amb Service, 17/02/2010** **page 132-133**
 - e. 20's Plenty, 22/02/2010** **Attached at end**

APPENDIX 1: PANEL'S SCOPING PAPER

Scrutiny Panel Investigation into 20 mph speed limits/zones

Scoping Paper

Contents:

1. Scrutiny Panel Membership
2. Scoping Scrutiny Panels
3. Background Information/Focus of the Enquiry
4. Draft terms of Reference
5. Methodology and Research
6. Suggested Witnesses
7. Suggested Timetable
8. Appendix

1. Scrutiny Panel Membership

Cllr Paul Elgood
Cllr Gill Mitchell
Cllr Geoff Wells
Cllr Pete West

2. Scoping Ad Hoc Panels

At its meeting on the 9 November 2009 the Environment and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee (ECSOSC) agreed to set up a Scrutiny Panel to look at the issue of 20 mph speed limits/zones in the city. This decision was taken in response to: the large amount of interest displayed from residents and councillors about 20 mph speed limits/zones; a Notice of Motion submitted to Council on 8 October 2009 (agenda item 24f); and a letter received by the committee from the Cabinet Member for Environment on 06 October 2009.

Ad hoc panels are intended to *“carry out short, sharply focused pieces of scrutiny work. As a guide, the work of these Panels should be capable of being conducted within 3 meetings or less.”* (Constitution: 6.1[5.1])

Issues to consider:

1. Subject

- What, precisely, is the issue the Panel wants to consider (bearing in mind the need to remain “sharply focused”)?
- Are there any specific aspects of this issue which Panel members wish to exclude from consideration?

2. Objectives

- What kind of general outcome is the Panel aiming to achieve?
- Do Panel members have specific outcomes which they wish to achieve?

3. Recommendations

- To whom does the Panel envisage making recommendations (BHCC departments, partner agencies etc)?

4. Terms of Reference

- Agreed terms of reference for the Panel

5. Methodology and Research

- How is the Panel going to undertake its investigation?
- Should Panel members be guided by any specific pieces of research?
- Who should be invited to give evidence?
- Is a site visit necessary? Where to?
- Possible timetables for meetings etc

3. Background Information/Focus of the Enquiry

Why undertake a scrutiny review of 20 mph speed limits/zones?

There has been increasing interest from local residents and councillors regarding the introduction of 20 mph speed limits/zones in residential and built-up areas of the city. The Cabinet Member for Environment in the last 12 months alone has received five petitions (with 1,282 signatures in total) from residents in different areas of the city, as well as two written letters/questions from councillors specifically on this issue. Additionally since June 2008 a further 14 petitions (with 2,293 signatures in total) have been submitted to the Environment Cabinet Member concerning related road safety issues such as pedestrian crossings, traffic calming measures, and speeding. (See Appendix 1 for more information.)

Nationally, there has been increasing pressure on the government to reduce the default speed limit on roads in residential and built-up areas from 30 to 20 mph. Amongst those exerting pressure are many road safety organisations and campaigns including: the Campaign For Better Transport, Living Streets, RoadPeace, The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA), and the 20s Plenty Campaign.

A government circular released in 2006 offers advice on the settling of local speed limits. It advises that 20 mph speeds need to be self-enforcing. On roads, therefore, where the average speed of traffic is higher than 24 mph, in order to ensure that speeds of 20 mph are achieved, traffic calming measures should be used. However, on roads where the average speed limit is already 24 mph or less, as a result of local conditions which make it difficult to drive faster than this, there is reasonable expectation that 20 mph signs alone could reduce average speeds to 20 mph.

The Department for Transport (DfT) has consulted on its next road safety strategy, to be published later on this year. It is likely that as part of the new strategy the DfT will issue further guidance on setting speed limits and will encourage local authorities, overtime, to reduce speed limits on urban roads and to introduce 20 mph speeds on streets in their area. Roads effected will be those which are primarily residential in nature, and those where pedestrian and cyclist movements are high (eg outside schools, shops, markets and playgrounds) and where the road is not part of any major through route.

The recent cross-party parliamentary report on improving road safety for pedestrians and cyclists noted that speed is a large factor in determining the severity of injuries to pedestrians and cyclists, whose chances of survival diminish rapidly at speeds over 20 mph, and that 20 mph zones in residential areas are effective at reducing the incident and severity of accidents. The report also noted that child pedestrians from deprived areas were four times more likely than children from non-deprived areas to be involved in a road accident.

Research suggests that the higher the speed of a vehicle the higher the severity of a road traffic accident. A pedestrian hit by a car at 40 mph has about an 85% chance of being killed. This drops to about 45% when hit by a car at 30 mph and only about a 5% chance of being killed when hit by a car travelling at 20 mph.

What are 20 mph speed limits/zones?

There are two ways of reducing the legal speed limit to 20 mph in residential and built-up areas. These are:



Using no physical measures (20 mph signs only) – this approach uses terminal and repeater signs to indicate a 20 mph speed limit. This kind of approach is ideally used on roads where speeds are already quite low and further traffic calming measures are not required. If speeds are particularly high than this approach is less likely to reduce speeds to 20 mph or lower. This approach is relatively inexpensive to implement.

Using physical measures (20 mph zones) – this approach uses terminal signs together with suitable traffic calming measures to provide a self-enforcing element. 20 mph zones can be used where excessive speeding occurs and where traffic calming measures would be needed to ensure speeds are kept at, or below, 20 mph. Zones are particularly appropriate where there is an existing record of accidents involving children occurring in an area, or where there are concentrations of pedestrians and/or cyclists. However, this approach is expensive and requires road re-design and engineering. Traffic calming measures include: road humps, raised junction tables, speed cushions, chicanes, pinch points, gateways, mini roundabouts, narrowings and bends.



Local authorities are responsible for determining what speed limits/zones should be used in a particular area, and for considering what type of intervention is most appropriate and most beneficial for increasing road safety and minimising the impact on the local environment. It is important that the form of intervention chosen does not require unreasonable levels of enforcement by the police. Speed restrictions tend to be more effective if they are imposed over several roads rather than just an individual road or stretch of road.

Which is most effective at reducing speed, 20mph signs only or 20 mph zones?

20 mph zones:

The Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) reviewed the impact of 250, 20 mph zones in Great Britain and found that on average, the annual frequency of accidents fell by 60%; the number of child pedestrian accidents fell by 70%; the number of child cyclist accidents fell by 48%; and the number of accidents for all cyclists fell by 29%.

The average speed of vehicles in 20 mph zones also dropped. The average speed at a calming measure was found to be 13.2 mph (with a range of 8 – 19 mph), and the average speed between calming measures was 17.8 mph (with a range of 14 – 23 mph). This data indicates that traffic calming measures are effective in reducing speeds to 20 mph. Overall, 20 mph zones helped to reduce vehicle speeds by 9.3 mph, from an average speed of 25 mph before an intervention, to 16 mph afterwards.

The data collected for the TRL review also showed that there was, on average, a 27% reduction in traffic flow on roads where 20 mph zones had been introduced, and an increase in traffic flows on surrounding streets of approximately 12%. Accident migration onto surrounding streets did not appear to be a significant problem; however, the review did advise that care should be taken in the design of streets to avoid traffic transferring to unsuitable routes.

The cost of the 20 mph zone schemes investigated as part of the TRL review varied widely and depended on the size of the area affected and the types of measures being used. The most expensive was £2.3 million. However, the typical cost of an average scheme was £100,000 - £200,000.

20 mph signs only:

The TRL also carried out a review to assess the effectiveness of reducing speed from 30 to 20 mph through introducing just 20 mph signs without any extra self-enforcing physical measures or road engineering. TRL assessed a number of such schemes which had been undertaken in Great Britain, as well as internationally. It found that in every area (except one) where a signs only approach was used there were only slight reductions in speed and no significant reduction in the number of accidents or injuries occurring. On average, a speed reduction of only 1 - 2 mph was recorded, although this

increased to about 3 mph if the approach was accompanied by extensive public awareness campaigns and police enforcement.

The one exception to this occurred in Graz, in Austria, where a signs only approach managed to achieve a 27% decrease in accidents and injuries occurring at junctions; although, no significant reduction in accidents on streets which had undergone a speed reduction was achieved. The TRL review concluded that encouraging speed reduction through using 20 mph signs only was insufficiently effective in reducing speeds to 20 mph or lower and in achieving a marked reduction in accidents and injuries.

As part of this review the TRL assessed a range of measures and their effectiveness on reducing speed. It found that by far the most effective measure for reducing mean speeds was traffic calming measures, which reduced mean speeds by 9.3 mph. Speed cameras were found to reduce mean speeds by 6 mph, vehicle-activated signs by 4.2 mph, flashing signs (not vehicle-activated) by 3.8 mph, whilst static signs reduced mean speeds by only 2.2 mph.

What is happening already in Brighton and Hove?

Brighton and Hove currently has a number of 20 mph zones within the city, although no 20 mph signs only speed limits. Current policy within Brighton and Hove is to tackle areas where a number of accidents have occurred in a particular area.

There is a Safer Routes to School initiative in the city which aims to reduce the dependency on the car for the school journey, by improving the area around the school and making routes to school safer for children and their parents/carers to walk or cycle. This is a joint initiative involving the local authority, school staff, pupils, parents and local residents. As part of this programme an assessment of issues around a school are conducted and potential solutions identified. The potential solutions identified may involve speed restrictions on nearby roads and traffic calming measures. So far ten schools across the city have been involved in the initiative.

The Road Safety Team at the council recently procured the consultant company Petter Brett Associates (PBA) to undertake a Speed Limit Review within the city. PBA has completed a review of the A and B roads in the city and the results of the review should be available soon. A review of the remaining roads within the city is to begin shortly and likely to run over the next several months. Both of these reviews, when completed, should offer independent advice as to which speed limits are appropriate for which roads in the city. The findings from the speed reviews should ideally be considered by the scrutiny panel and be used to support the final recommendations put forward by the panel. The evidence supplied from the PBA reviews as well as other evidence collected by the panel should enable this scrutiny review to advise on the principles of a policy approach to 20 mph speeds in Brighton and Hove.

What is happening in other cities across the country?

Portsmouth

Portsmouth City Council was the first local authority to introduce an area-wide 20 mph speed limit covering the majority of its residential roads – 94% of its road network. This was possible due to the unique layout and demography of the city. The scheme was implemented partly to support the already low driving speeds in some areas which had been adopted as a result of narrow carriageways or high volumes of parked cars, and partly to encourage less aggressive driving by those driving at inappropriate speeds. The scheme involved the introduction of gateways made up of terminal signs and 20 mph roundel(s) marked on the carriageway, and the erection of repeater signs; but, no physical traffic calming measures were installed. A high level of public consultation was undertaken and the scheme cost £570,000 to implement; although, this figure probably does not include the cost of the consultation or subsidiary costs which, when included, would significantly increase the overall cost of the scheme.

An independent interim report, commissioned by the DfT, has just finished assessing the effects of this scheme, 12 months after it was first implemented. The interim report analysed changes in traffic speeds in Portsmouth and the number of road casualties by comparing before and after data collected by the council. No analysis of traffic migration or vehicle composition was undertaken.

On most of the roads included in the scheme speeds prior to the changes were less than or equal to 24 mph. However, some roads where median speeds were higher than 24 mph were included in order to ensure a consistent and a non-confusing approach to the reduction of speeds in the city. The average speed after the changes were implemented was 0.9 mph lower than the average speed before the changes (24 mph). On roads where average speeds had been higher than 24 mph before the changes, an average speed reduction of 7 mph was achieved. However, 14 out of the 21 sites which fell into this category still had average speeds after the scheme was implemented of between 24 mph and 29 mph.

The analysis showed that the total accident reduction was 13% and the number of casualties fell by 15%. Killed and seriously injured casualty numbers stayed the same whilst killed and seriously injured accidents increased by 2%. None of these results were statistically significant when compared against national trends, and it is difficult to tell if there has been an actual reduction in casualty numbers from such a small data set.

The interim report concluded that the average speed reduction achieved by installing 20 mph signs only was less in comparison to those achieved by 20 mph zones, although some roads do appear to have achieved a more marked reduction in speed it is not to the extent whereby 20 mph becomes self-enforcing.

Norwich

Over the summer of 2009, 20 mph signs only speed limits were introduced into three areas in Norwich as part of a trial project. An awareness campaign was also undertaken as part of the scheme. The data collected over a two month period indicated that the largest reduction in speed achieved was an average of 1 mph, and in many areas there was little change in average speeds, although the roads had previously seen relatively low speeds prior to the changes. The introduction of the 20 mph speed limits had shown no measurable impact on the numbers of vehicles using the roads. No personal injury accident was recorded over the duration of the pilot project; however, this was in accordance with previous accident data which suggested that on average there was one accident every 2.25 months in Norwich.

As part of the awareness campaign, residents were asked to complete surveys about the change in speed limits. There were 315 responses in total. Of those who responded:

- 59% did not think that the new 20 mph limits were working
- 80.3% supported the new 20 mph limits
- 45.1% agreed that speed awareness signs help to reinforce the 20 mph limit.
- 22.2% felt safer from traffic since the introduction of the 20 mph limits.
- 16.2 % indicated that they walk more now
- 4.8% indicated that they cycled more
- 21.9% think their area is a better place to live
- 68.2% think the 20 mph limit should be rolled out to all non-classified residential roads in Norwich.

A recent Norfolk citizen's panel, involving 542 individuals, when asked about signs only 20 mph speed limits suggested that 57% wanted to see a 20 mph speed limit on all residential roads and 43% did not.

The key messages from the trial project included:

- Before the 20 mph speed limits were introduced average vehicle speeds in the pilot areas were well below 30 mph limit
- The introduction of a 20 mph speed limit has little or no effect on speeds in the majority of roads
- The majority of people want to see 20 mph speed limits introduced on residential roads
- The majority of people think that 20 mph speed limits are ineffective

The pilot project undertaken in Norwich questioned whether a signs only approach to reducing speed limits to 20 mph provides value for money, where there are few tangible effects apart from a small reduction in speed and a level of public satisfaction achieved. It was decided that no further action would be taken on the issue of 20 mph speed limits until more advice was issued from the DfT on the use of 20 mph speed limits in residential areas, in the hope that issues around funding and police enforcement may be resolved.

Bristol

Bristol City Council has just completed a public engagement exercise aimed at consulting with residents over proposals to introduce 20 mph signs only speed limits in many of its residential areas. Further information on the results of this consultation exercise are to be published shortly, however, recent publicity on the issue suggests that the Council will be going ahead with reducing the speed limit in many of its residential areas.

Oxford

Oxfordshire County Council introduced 20 mph speed limits on almost all of its residential roads in September 2009. Roads where there was a reduction in the speed limit from 30 to 20 mph included: almost all residential minor roads, un-numbered through roads (except where they formed part of a busy bus route), and some A/B roads which are part of the busy shopping districts in the centre. The signs only approach to reducing the speed limit had an estimated cost of between £250,000 and £300,000.

London

The London Road Safety Unit commissioned a recent review of 20 mph zones and road safety in London. In 2007/08 there were some 399 20 mph zones in the city, with some boroughs being more enthusiastic about introducing zones than others. The introduction of 20 mph zones have had a positive impact on reducing casualties particularly for those aged between 0 – 15 and for car occupants. The report suggests that within 20 mph zones there was a 42% reduction in casualties in comparison to areas outside the zones. Although the impact of 20 mph zones on casualty numbers has declined over time, those zones introduced between 2000 and 2006 still reduced casualties by 23% and 3% in adjacent areas.

The analysed data also suggested that the majority of those injured in 20 mph zonal areas were local residents, which suggests that less drivers use these areas for 'rat-running'. There was no evidence of collision migration on to nearby roads. The report suggests that 20 mph zones implemented in high casualty areas do prove to be cost effective; however, zones introduced in low casualty areas were less cost effective. The report suggested that 20 mph zones become cost effective when a road has over 0.7 casualties per km.

Transport for London and the boroughs aim to set up the pan London safety forum where they aim to manage speeds through safety cameras, home zones and 20 mph zones.

Attitudes in London towards 20 mph zones vary; some boroughs advocate the use of only particular types of traffic calming interventions whilst others want to introduce a 20 mph speed limit on all roads (London Borough of Southwark). The London Borough of Barnet has a policy of reviewing the impact of speed bumps with the potential of removing them altogether, whilst the Borough of Kensington and Chelsea have a policy of considering the

implementation of zones only where there is a history of speed-related casualties; they have yet to find justification for introducing zones anywhere.

Background Documents/articles:

Notice of Motion – 08 October 2009, Council, Agenda Item 24(f)

<http://present.brighton-hove.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=117&MId=2082>

DfT, August 2006, *DfT Circular 01/2006: Setting Local Speed Limits*,

<http://www.DfT.gov.uk/pgr/roadsafety/speedmanagement/DfTcircular106/DfTcircular106.pdf>

DfT, April 2009, *A Safer Way: Consultation on Making Britain's Roads the Safest in the World*,

<http://www.DfT.gov.uk/pgr/roadsafety/roadsafetyconsultation/>

Parliamentary report, 2009, *House of Commons Public Accounts Committee Improving road safety for pedestrians and cyclists in Great Britain*,

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmpubac/c/665/665.pdf>

DfT, Sept 1999, *Traffic Advisory Leaflet: 20 mph speed limits and zones*,

<http://www.DfT.gov.uk/print/pgr/roads/tpm/tal/trafficmanagement/20mphspeedlimitsandzones>

TRL, 1996, *TRL Report 215: Review of Traffic Calming schemes in 20 mph Zones*, <http://www.trl.co.uk/Library/>

TRL, 1998, *TRL Report 363: Urban Speed Management methods*,

<http://www.trl.co.uk/Library/>

Atkins, 2009, *Interim Evaluation of the Implementation of 20 mph Speed Limits in Portsmouth*,

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roadsafety/research/rsrr/theme4/interimeval20mphspeedlimits.pdf>

Report to Norwich Highways Agency committee, 24/11/2009,

http://www.norwich.gov.uk/intranet_docs/corporate/public/committee/reports/2009/Highways/REP_NHAC_20_mph_2009_09_24.pdf

Grundy C, Steinbach R, Edwards P, Wilkinson P and Green J., 2008, *20 mph Zones and Road Safety in London: A report to the London Road Safety Unit. London: LSHTM*, <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/20-mph-zones-and-road-safety-in-london.pdf>

Useful Websites:

Campaign for Better Transport: <http://www.bettertransport.org.uk/>

Living Streets: <http://www.livingstreets.org.uk/>

RoadPeace: <http://www.roadpeace.org/>

RoSPA: <http://www.rospace.com/>

20s Plenty: <http://www.20splentyforus.org.uk/>

4. Draft Terms of Reference

- To gain an understanding of the collision statistics
- To seek a range of views as to the impact of 20 mph speed limits and 20 mph zones on road safety in terms of reducing vehicle speeds and casualty numbers
- To investigate what options other local authorities across the country are pursuing in terms of 20 mph speed limits/zones
- To gain an understanding of the potential environmental impacts of 20 mph speeds on air quality, tail pipe and carbon emissions as well as noise
- To gain an understanding of the potential 'other benefits' which 20 mph speeds may bring, such as health benefits, increased sociability, and better walking and cycling conditions
- To gain an understanding of any potential consequences of any displacement of traffic as a result of introducing lower speed limits
- To gain an understanding of the speed limit review currently being undertaken in the city and the links with this investigation
- To identify the benefits, feasibility and potential costs of various 20 mph speed options for the city
- To develop recommendations for the future development of council policy on 20 mph speed limits/zones

5. Methodology and Research

1. Develop Understanding of issues
 - Council policy
 - National policy context
 - Comparison with policies in other authorities
2. Impact of the current policies/practices
 - Evidence from interested parties
 - Site visits on key areas to gain an understanding of local driving speeds.
3. Discussion on key issues that need to be addressed and development of recommendations
 - What should the Panel recommend?
 - Is there the evidence to support the recommendations?

- Does more investigation need to be undertaken?

Testing of recommendations

- Implications of recommendations tested on officers
- Legality of recommendations checked
- Financial?

6. Suggested Witnesses

Relevant Council Officers

- Road Safety Team / PBA
- Traffic control/management/engineering
- Environmental health – air quality, emissions and noise

Other groups

- Health?
- Schools
- Parents groups
- Residents groups – groups from suburban areas eg Woodingdean/Rottingdean, as well as urban neighbourhoods?
- Neighbourhood Renewal Groups/Local Action Teams?
- 60+ Action Group/Pensioners forum
- Community Transport

Road Safety Organisations

- Living Streets

Sustainable Transport groups

- Cycling groups
- Pedestrian groups

Drivers Organisations

- RAC/AA/Association of British Drivers?
- Christopher Sparrow?

Sussex Police (and any relevant partnerships) – issues of enforcement

Services potentially affected by a reduction in speed

- Emergency Services – Fire/Police/Ambulance
- Bus Company
- CityClean – Rubbish Collection Vehicles
- Taxi drivers

Site Visit – to a school assessment or police enforcement exercise?

7. Suggested Timetable

- Private scoping meeting – Tue 1 Dec. 2009
- 1st Public meeting – Jan. 2010
- 2nd Public meeting – Jan. 2010

- 3rd Public meeting – Feb. 2010
- Site visit – Jan/Feb. 2010
- Private meeting to discuss draft report– Mar. 2010
- Private meeting to agree final report – Mar. 2010
- Final report sent to ECSOSC – 19 Apr. 2010

8. Appendix

In the last year there has been increasing interest from local residents and councillors regarding the introduction of 20mph speed limits/zones in various areas in the city. A number of petitions and written questions/letters from councillors have been submitted to the Environment Cabinet Member (ECM) specifically on this issue.

In total the ECM has received two written questions/letters from councillors and five petitions on this issue, all in the last 12 months.

ECM Meeting: 11 December 2008

Agenda item 78:

A written question to the ECM from Councillor Hamilton regarding the need for urgent consideration of a school safety zone and 20 mph limit in the Southern Cross Area from the traffic lights up to the Loxdale area.

Response: The ECM asked council officers to consult with Sussex Police regarding speed in the area and to consider which speed reduction measures could be used to encourage speed reduction.

ECM Meeting: 19 February 2009

Agenda item 106(ii):

Councillor Davies submitted a petition to the ECM signed by 372 people requesting the implementation of a 20mph speed limit at the eastern end of Goldsmid Ward

Response: That there was a review already being undertaken on speed limits on A and B roads within the city, and the remaining C roads would be reviewed after this.

The petition was noted.

ECM Meeting: 30 July 2009

Agenda item 15(iii):

Councillor Barnett submitted a petition signed by 114 people calling for a 20mph speed limit in parts of Hangleton & Knoll.

Response: That the road safety team would review the situation in the area, however, that this would take some time to conduct the necessary research.

Agenda item 15(iv):

Councillor Kemble submitted a petition signed by 196 people calling for a 20mph speed limit and a safe crossing on New Church Road in the vicinity of The Fold School and Deepdene School.

Response: That the petition be noted and that a report on the issue be brought to a future ECM Meeting.

Agenda item 18(b):

A letter was received from Councillor West calling for traffic calming and a 20mph speed limit to be introduced in St Nicholas Road to combat road safety

issues around St Paul's CE Primary School. Councillor Davey spoke in support of this letter as Councillor West was unable to attend and submitted a supporting petition signed by 43 people calling for 20mph speed limit in the West Hill area and beyond.

Response: That the letter be noted.

ECM Meeting: 24 September 2009

Agenda item 34 (i):

Councillor Davies submitted a petition signed by 268 people concerning pedestrian safety in the Clarendon Area of Hove.

Response: that this was not an area where there were records of pedestrian injuries caused by excessive speeds, however, the Environment Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee (ECOSOSC) would be considering the issue of speed limits shortly. That the petition be noted.

Full council: 08 October 2009

Agenda item 16.2:

Councillor Davies presented a petition signed by 289 residents concerning the reduction of the speed limit to 20mph in Osmond and Davigdor roads.

Response: Referred to item 24(f) on the agenda

Agenda item 24(f):

Notice of motion proposed by Councillor Davey and seconded by Councillor Steedman.

ECM Meeting: 24 September 2009

Agenda item 32.1:

The Cabinet Member reported that to assist with the evaluation of speed limits on minor roads and in light of the large number of individual requests received by the council he would be referring the issue of 20 mph speed limits to the ECSOSC. The Committee would also consider the evaluation report on the Portsmouth 20mph Pilot Scheme. Following the Chairman's announcement, Councillor Theobald wrote to the ECSOSC to request that this issue be considered.

There have been a further 14 petitions submitted to ECM since June 2008 concerning related road safety issues in the city.

ECM Meeting: 5 June 2008

Agenda item 8(iii):

Councillor Caulfield submitted a petition signed by 249 people requesting a pelican crossing on the A270 between Barcombe road shops and Wild Park.

Response: The petition was noted, but no immediate action taken as the area already has a good road safety record.

ECM Meeting: 11 September 2008

Agenda item 42(i):

Councillor Cobb submitted a petition signed by 98 people concerning a request for a pedestrian crossing for the doctor's surgery on Sackville Road.

Response: The petition was noted and a written response to be provided.

Agenda item 42(iv):

Councillor Alford submitted a petition signed by 866 people concerning a pedestrian crossing in Chalky road after the death of a young child in the area.

Response: Council officers to meet with Councillor Alford to discuss this petition and that the petition be noted.

ECM Meeting: 06 November 2008

Agenda item 60(1):

Deputation concerning road safety in Highdown Road

Response: that there is no significant number of injuries in this area, however, that the matter will be referred to council officers for action.

Agenda item 61(iv):

Councillor Davies presented a petition signed by 269 people concerning road safety issues in Highdown Road.

Response: That the petition be noted.

Agenda item 61 (v):

Councillor Kennedy submitted a petition signed by 358 people concerning safe access to Preston Park.

Response: that there are no significant bad records of injuries or accidents in this area, but that the petition be noted.

Agenda item 61 (vi):

Councillor Carden submitted a petition signed by 288 people concerning traffic calming measures in Chalky road/Fox way after the death of a young child in the area.

Response: That the petition be noted and forwarded on for action by council officers

ECM Meeting: 11 December 2008

Agenda item 74 (iv):

Councillor Lepper submitted a petition signed by 88 people concerning requests for traffic calming at Stanmer Villas.

Response: that the petition be noted and Sussex police asked to increase enforcement in the area.

ECM Meeting: 19 February 2009

Agenda item 106 (iii):

Councillor Davies submitted a petition signed by 29 people concerning parking problems, speeding vehicles and flooding in Shirley road in Hove.

Response: That the petition be noted.

Agenda item 109 (i):

Councillor Barnett submitted two petitions regarding traffic issues regarding Hangleton and Knoll Ward.

ECM Meeting: 7 May 2009

Agenda item 138(iii):

Councillor Barnett submitted a petition signed by 48 people requesting the installation of speed cameras in King George VI Avenue.

Response: That the petition be noted.

ECM Meeting: 4 June 2009

Agenda item 8(a):

A letter was received by Councillor Barnett regarding calls for single yellow lines to be installed at the junction of Woodruff Avenue and Goldstone Crescent on safety grounds.

ECM Meeting: 30 July 2009

Agenda item 17(a+b)

(a) Road safety at the junction of Dyke Road Drive, Stanford Road, and Highcroft Villas.

(b) Road safety issues in Chalky Road, Portslade.

Response: That the petition be noted.

APPENDIX 2: MINUTES OF PANEL'S SCOPING MEETING

Scrutiny Panel Scoping Meeting Notes

Tues 01 Dec 2009, 9.30 – 11.30, venue: Room 126, King's House

Present: Councillors Pete West, Geoff Wells, Gill Mitchell, Paul Elgood.
Phil Clarke, Tom Hook, Libby Young.

1. Welcome and introductions

2. Election of chair

Councillor Pete West was elected as Chair.

3. Declarations of interest

All Councillors declared a level of interest in speed reduction measures, having raised the issue of speed or petitioned on behalf of residents for speed reductions previously. Geoff Wells also declared that he is a member of the Woodingdean Speed Watch Team.

4. Agree title of panel

Agreed that the chair will decide on the title.

Title decided upon – Speed Reduction Review: An investigation into 20 mph speed limits/zones

5. KSI Data and discussion on key issues

Phil Clarke, the Road Safety Manager, talked the Panel through some of the headline Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) figures for Brighton & Hove and the issues the data raises.

There were 141 KSI casualties in 2008, and although this is an improvement on previous years, it is unlikely that the authority will be able to meet the very stringent targets set by the Department for Transport (DfT) for 2010. There is the difficulty that with the KSI figures being so low, picking up trends is much more difficult and data can be easily skewed.

The most cited contributory factor recorded by police officers when attending a collision is a failure to look properly. This was cited in about 32% of all reported injury collisions between 1st Nov. 2006 and 31st Oct. 2009. The second largest contributory factor recorded was a failure to judge the other persons path or speed, and this was cited in about 17% of collisions. Lack of attention on the part of all road users, is an important contributory factor in accidents in Brighton and Hove. The 15th most commonly cited contributory factor is exceeding the speed limit. However, contributory factors recorded at the site of an accident are subject to police and witness perceptions and judging whether vehicles were actually speeding is difficult in most situations. Additionally, factors such as lack of attention, careless driving,

following too close, sudden braking etc, are all likely to be exacerbated by higher speeds; the lower the speed, the more time everyone has to react and potentially avoid serious and/or fatal accidents.

Portsmouth introduced a blanket 20 mph speed limit on 94% of its road network a year ago, and an interim evaluation report has been released. As well as a reduction in speed there have been other measures which have been undertaken which impact on traffic movement which have not been reported on; for example, the introduction of one way streets, new parking schemes, and dead-end roads. It is difficult to judge just how successful the Portsmouth scheme has been.

Locally, the link between deprived areas and higher child KSI statistics does not appear to exist. Work has just begun, however, as part of the Safer Routes to School Programme on scoping Queens Park and Whitehawk to see what measures could benefit these areas. The Safer Routes to School Programme has implemented many of the 20 mph zones in the city, and indeed the vast majority of 20 mph zones are currently around schools. North Street has also undergone extensive re-engineering in order to engineer out the excessive speed factor. Most work is done at locations where there has been a history of a high number of accidents.

The council does not currently hold data on average speeds in the city as speed surveys tend to be performed as and where necessary. There is a need to ensure that speed limits are appropriate. Drivers tend to understand that in some locations lower limits are more appropriate and are more likely to adhere to them. However, there is the danger that if the limit is not appropriate, drivers will not adhere to it. This can create a false sense of security for other more vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists which expect traffic to be driving slower than it is. Additionally, the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) stance is that as a norm a 20 mph speed limit should be self-enforcing and therefore they won't routinely undertake enforcement activity in such limits. They will still undertake enforcement in special circumstances (very rare) or where there are identified prolific repeat offenders.

The Road Safety Team receives a lot of petitions about speed but often when speed tests are undertaken, speeds are much lower than perceived. For example, if average speeds are only 22 mph on a stretch or road, although they may be perceived as being higher, the cost effectiveness of introducing a 20 mph speed limit or zone is questionable. It is possible, however, that reducing speed on non-arterial roads could bring about a reduction of speed on main arterial roads as well, and so encourage a lower speed culture.

The next national road safety strategy, to be published shortly, will be considering the case of 20 mph zones/limits in residential and urban

areas. It is likely that local authorities will be free to implement 20 mph limits/zones as suits their local situation. Additional guidance is due to be released by DfT on this matter.

Currently, the road safety team are undertaking scoping work around Queens Park and Whitehawk as part of the Safer Routes to School Programme. However, no further work on reducing speed in areas of the city will be undertaken until the outcome of the speed limit review and the scrutiny panel have been decided (unless an urgent case arises).

A Speed limit review is being conducted by PBA (Peter Brett Associates) and is a statutory requirement for the Local Authority. The review on A&B roads in the city is due to be published shortly. The review of C and Unclassified roads is in the early stages. The city will be divided into 81 demographically similar cities, and speed surveys, video footage, counts of volume of traffic, will all be used to assess whether the current speed of various areas is appropriate or not. The data will be collected up until the end of this financial year and the bulk of the analysis undertaken after April 2010.

Key issues for the panel

To have more information about the Performance Indicators.

To have more information and data on average speeds in the city.

To understand the scope of implementation of 20 mph zones in Brighton and Hove eg timetable, funding and availability.

To understand how well matched the responsiveness of the current approach is to the demand for calming/lower speeds, especially beyond the Safer Routes to School Programmes.

To look in detail at existing 20 mph zones in order to understand how effective current zones in the city are, and the reasons why they have been introduced. (No formal evaluation has been undertaken to date.)

To investigate what the current protocols/criteria are around how residents can ask for a speed reduction in their area and the feedback mechanisms used.

That reducing the speed in urban areas has other benefits such as increasing residents' quality of life and that speed reduction may lead to a safer environment which encourages more sustainable transport.

To understand to what extent vehicles manage to reach the current speed limits in the city and in residential areas.

To understand the impact lower speeds in residential areas may have on speeds on arteriole roads. Can a wide-spread 20 mph speed limit lead to creating a culture of slower driving?

To look at whether traffic calming measures and speed reductions can cause a displacement of traffic and contribute to 'rat running' on other roads.

To understand more fully the speed limit review which is being undertaken by PBA and how it links with this scrutiny review.

To speak with residents who have lived in a 20 mph zone for sometime to understand the impact it has had upon them, and to speak to residents who have submitted petitions for speed reductions in the past.

To understand the impact that lower speeds may have on the city's air quality.

6. Scoping paper

Objectives of the Panel

To ensure a clear set of outcomes from this scrutiny review.

To report specific recommendations on speed limit changes and a clear approach to 20 mph limits/zones in the city.

To be clearer about the protocol for residents requesting 20 mph speed limits/zones in their area.

To consider the technical, financial and legal implications of the final recommendations made.

Terms of Reference

The following terms of reference were agreed by the panel:

- To gain an understanding of the collision statistics
- To seek a range of views as to the impact of 20 mph speed limits and 20 mph zones on road safety in terms of reducing vehicle speeds and casualty numbers
- To investigate what options other local authorities across the country are pursuing in terms of 20 mph speed limits/zones
- To gain an understanding of the potential environmental impacts of 20 mph speeds on air quality, tail pipe and carbon emissions as well as noise
- To gain an understanding of the potential 'other benefits' which 20 mph speeds may bring, such as health benefits, increased sociability, and better walking and cycling conditions
- To gain an understanding of any potential consequences of any displacement of traffic as a result of introducing lower speed limits
- To gain an understanding of the speed limit review currently being undertaken in the city and the links with this investigation

- To identify the benefits, feasibility and potential costs of various 20 mph speed options for the city
- To develop recommendations for the future development of council policy on 20 mph speed limits/zones

Evidence Gathering

Consider policy statements, and the impact of those policies.

Consider what policies other local authorities have pursued.

Listen to witnesses – invite written and verbal evidence.

Undertake site visits in Brighton and Hove to see:

- (a) 20 mph zone(s) already in place
- (b) the urban and suburban situations
- (c) a problem area not yet calmed

Meetings and Witnesses

Exact dates for the meetings will be confirmed shortly. The road safety team will be invited to attend all meetings to act as special advisors.

- 1st Public meeting – Jan. 2010
- 2nd Public meeting – Jan. 2010
- 3rd Public meeting – Feb. 2010
- 4th Public meeting – Feb 2010
- Site visit – Jan/Feb. 2010
- Private meeting to discuss draft report– Mar. 2010
- Private meeting to agree final report – Mar. 2010
- Final report sent to ECSOSC – 19 Apr. 2010

Statements and written evidence will be requested from a wide variety of organisations in order to canvass opinion as widely as possible.

The following organisations and groups will be invited to attend and give verbal evidence at the public meetings:

1st Public Meeting: Road Safety Team
Environmental health/Environmental Protection
Portsmouth/Bristol
Police

2nd Public Meeting: Drivers Associations
Living Streets
Brighton bus Company

3rd Public Meeting: Older people's council
Youth council
2 x LATS/Neighbourhood groups
Parents Association

4th Public Meeting: An open invitation to all residents and organisations to attend this meeting and have the opportunity to talk to the panel about their views on

20 mph speed limits/zones. Those attending will have 5 minutes to talk to the panel about their views.

7. Publicity

An initial press release will be issued as soon as possible. An additional press release will be issued prior to the first public meeting. The press release will include a quote from the chair and list those councillors on the panel, as well as give further information about the review. The open invitation public meeting will be advertised in city news, on the website and press released to the argus and the leader.

8. Any Other Business

None.

APPENDIX 3A: MINUTES OF PANEL'S PUBLIC MEETING: 19/01/2010

**Brighton and Hove City Council
Environment and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Ad Hoc Panel – 20 mph speed limits/zones**

**10.00 am 19 January 2010
Minutes**

Present: Councillors West (Chairman), Mitchell, Watkins, Wells, Bennett
Also present: Mark Dunn, John Stewart, Sam Rouse, Tim Nichols, Phil Clarke, Libby Young

Part One

1 Procedural business

1a Declaration of substitutes

1.1 Substitutes are not allowed on Scrutiny Panels.

1b Declaration of interest

1.2 Cllr West declared that he had previously supported a petition for a 20 mph speed limit in one area of his ward. Cllr Wells declared that he is a member of the Woodingdean speed watch team. Cllr Watkins declared that he had in the past offered support to many of his constituents who wanted 20 mph speed limits in their area. Cllr Bennett declared that she had also supported residents in her own ward and been involved in historic discussions around 20 mph speed limits.

1c Declaration of party whip

1.3 There were none.

1d Exclusion of press and public

1.4 In accordance with section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, it was considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if the members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in section 100I of the said Act.

1.5 **Resolved** – That the press and public are not excluded from the meeting.

2 Chairman's communications

- 2.1 The proceedings were opened by welcoming all those present and introducing the members of the panel, the witnesses, and the officers present. The chairman thanked everyone for their involvement, particularly the witnesses and officers for taking the time to attend the public meeting and for being involved in the evidence gathering process.
- 2.2 It was noted that included in the agenda were the agreed Terms of Reference for the members of the panel to refer to should they need to.
- 2.3 For the benefit of all attendees the purpose of the scrutiny review was reiterated as: to investigate the effects of reducing the speed limit in some residential and built-up areas of the city to 20 mph. Speed reduction initiatives could include either redesigning roads within the city to include traffic calming measures, or simply reducing the default speed limit on roads to 20 mph through the use of signs only.
- 2.4 The evidence gathering process for the review, previously agreed by the panel, was also reiterated as: there are three public meetings being held, including this one, where various expert witnesses will be invited to attend to give verbal evidence to the panel. There will be a fourth public meeting where residents and local groups will be invited to give evidence to the panel. The panel may also undertake a site visit to collect further evidence. Various other organisations are being contacted and invited to submit written evidence for the panel to consider.
- 2.5 The format of the meeting was outlined, and it was noted that as members of the public are invited to apply to give verbal evidence to the panel at the panel's fourth and final meeting, or to submit written comments, there was no time allocated at this meeting for members of the public to ask questions or make points.
- 2.6 The panel agreed to proceed as outlined by the Chairman.

3 Evidence from the witnesses

- 3.1 The panel heard evidence from a number of witnesses.
- 3.2a **Evidence from Mark Dunn, Traffic Management, Road Policing Unit, Sussex Police**

There are a number of DfT (Department for Transport) circulars offering guidance to highway authorities on the enforcement of 20 mph speed limits. Currently, Sussex Police follows the guidance in the DfT circulars, which are also supported by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPOs). Sussex Police will, therefore, support 20 mph speed limits only where they are self-enforcing; either because the nature of the road means that the mean speed of traffic is 24 mph or less, or because traffic calming measures are introduced to force traffic to

travel at 20 mph. Where roads are not conducive to slower speeds or not engineered to slow traffic, Sussex Police would not expect to undertake enforcement in respect of a 20 mph limit which has been introduced without being in accordance with the DfT guidelines.

Speed enforcement currently involves either a fixed penalty notice, or a court summons. The only means of dealing with 20 mph excess speed offences is by way of summons. This could have an impact on HM Court Services if they have to deal with a large increase of cases due to 20 mph limits, which would impact on the court's time. This is one reason why there is an expectation that 20 mph limits should be self-enforcing. Many drivers find it difficult to stick to a 30 mph speed limit and breaking the speed limit is something that every driver does, even if they claim not to. Achieving compliance to a 20 mph speed limit is likely to be difficult, particularly on roads which are wide and straight as drivers will not understand the need for a lower default speed limit. Additionally, there is the added danger that a variety of speed limits will confuse pedestrians who may expect traffic to be travelling at slower speeds than they actually are, and so lead to more collisions.

The ACPO revisited their advice on supporting 20 mph speed limits in 2009 and concluded that they still view compliance with 20 mph speed limits which are not self-enforcing as problematic. The DfT is currently reviewing its guidance on enforcement of 20 mph speed limits and ACPO will review its advice only in light of any significant changes to the DfT guidance. The tenor of the DfT letter of December 2009 indicated that any change in the guidance is unlikely.

As well as problems with compliance, there are some technical difficulties with the equipment which would be used to enforce 20 mph speed limits. Most speed cameras and other technologies currently in use are not approved by the Home Office for use under 30 mph, and therefore not suitable for use in a 20 mph context. With the increased use of digital technologies this is changing, for example some London Boroughs are using average speed cameras to support the introduction of non self-enforcing 20 mph speed limits; however, it will take some time for the appropriate technology to become widely and readily available.

In conclusion, Sussex Police will only support 20 mph speed limits which are self-enforcing, either because roads are already conducive to mean speeds of below 24 mph or because traffic calming measures are introduced to force traffic to drive at 20 mph. To achieve compliance to a 20 mph speed limit no additional enforcement activities should be required of the police.

- 3.2b The panel thanked Mark for his evidence.
- 3.2c Members of the panel asked about how drivers can be helped to comply with 20 mph speed limits when they are indicated by signs only.

- 3.2d The panel heard that traffic calming measures are required to force drivers to stick to a 20 mph speed limit and that the use of 20 mph speed signs alone will not guarantee that traffic will travel at 20 mph or below. This is particularly the case on long, straight, wide roads, such as the seafront road and other major through roads. A lot of traffic calming measures would be required to slow traffic on these types of roads. So, whilst the use of 20 mph signs may have an impact on some drivers it won't force all drivers to slow down. A lot of the enforcement issue is dependent upon what type of road a 20 mph speed limit is being imposed on.

Education campaigns also have a part to play in encouraging drivers to slow down and can be used to bring about a long-term change in driving behaviour. The Sussex Road Safety Partnership is trying to educate drivers to stick to the current 30 mph speed limits. However, speeding is an offence which most drivers will commit. A lot of road safety education campaigns focus on educating children in schools; however, there is only a limited amount of time in the timetable that this topic can be taught and as many young people leave school just as they reach the age to drive, education campaigns don't always target drivers at the right age.

- 3.2e Members of the panel noted that the evidence given appeared to indicate that roads suitable for 20 mph speed limits need to be properly identified, with engineering introduced to back them up if necessary, and with adequate and targeted road safety education campaigns. Members of the panel were interested to know if Sussex Police had a view on the proximity of 20 mph speed limits to each other and what issues needed to be considered when introducing either a blanket 20 mph speed limit or 20 mph speed limits in select areas. Members of the panel were concerned that drivers may become confused should they be faced with a variety of speed limits. The panel were also interested to know more about average speed cameras and how they could work in 20 mph areas.

- 3.2f The panel heard that targeting known problem areas is one of the better ways of introducing road safety initiatives. Such an approach offers clarity to road users as they become aware that lower speeds are there for a reason. Simplicity to speed limits is the key; use major through routes to keep traffic moving, and then judge other roads by their merits. There is no straight forward solution. Each case should be looked at, and ideally the whole city should be mapped and the whole transport infrastructure of the city considered when introducing 20 mph speed limits.

The speed of traffic on a road can be measured in a number of ways; however, the mean speed is always an indicator of what speed most motorists drive on a particular road most of the time. Speed cameras tend to work by taking a snapshot of the speed of a vehicle at a

particular time and point on a road. Average speed cameras work by recording the speed a vehicle travels between point A and B and identifies whether the vehicle travelled faster than it should have according to the speed limit in place on that particular road.

- 3.2g Members of the panel noted that many other areas of the country are introducing 20 mph speed limits on their roads through the use of signs only, and that many drivers are law abiding and will drive below 30 mph and therefore will surely abide by a 20 mph speed limit which is not self-enforcing.
- 3.2h The panel heard that in the right conditions 20 mph speed limits can be a useful tool to reduce the speed of traffic and make roads safer, however, the location and type of road is important. For example, on the seafront road, drivers are unlikely to abide by a 20 mph speed limit unless physical interventions are introduced, however on side roads, 20 mph speed limits may work. ACPO and Sussex Police are not opposed to speed reductions on roads, as long as it requires no extra enforcement resources from the police. It is unlikely at the present time that additional police resources will be made available specifically for the enforcement of 20 mph speed limits in areas where they are not self-enforcing. Finally, whilst many drivers think that they will and do abide by speed restrictions in place, many do not.
- 3.2i Members of the panel were interested to know whether 20 mph speed limits and 20 mph zones contribute to rat running, traffic displacement, and higher speeds on roads adjacent to and close by, but not included in, 20 mph areas or zones.
- 3.2j The panel heard that there is a possibility that rat running, traffic displacement, and higher speeds could occur on roads adjacent to roads with 20 mph speed restrictions. Local residents tend to know the roads around where they live and will always try to pick the most direct and easiest route in and out of their area. The potential of displacement of traffic and problem areas, and of rat running needs to be considered when introducing speed reductions.
- 3.2k Members of the panel were interested to know if the city was to take a blanket approach to introducing 20 mph speed limits where all major through fares were to remain at 30 mph and all other roads were reduced to 20 mph, would road users understand the logic of the system and would Sussex Police support such a measure.
- 3.2l The panel heard that such a proposal would need to be carefully considered by the police before support could be offered, however, such an approach does appear to be a logical solution. If, however, the city has many roads which are long, straight, and very wide then traffic calming measures would need to be installed to force traffic to drive at 20 mph, otherwise motorists would be unlikely to abide by the 20 mph speed limit. Any approach to speed reduction should not be a

piecemeal approach but well thought out and integrated into the transport infrastructure of the city, and this is likely to require considerable resources.

3.2m The panel thanked Mark Dunn for his time and contributions.

3.3a **Evidence from Sam Rouse, Senior Technical Officer, Air Quality, Brighton & Hove City Council**

The legislation surrounding air quality standards has its roots in the 1990s. Air quality is the responsibility of the local authority as well as Defra, (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs), the Environment Agency, and other organisations. Areas with poor air quality have set up Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) with the aim of improving air quality. 235 local authorities have AQMAs (60%) and this is likely to only increase. In 2004, Brighton and Hove declared its first AQMA. Locally, nitrogen dioxide is the biggest air polluter. Brighton and Hove has had an action plan aimed at increasing air quality in its 2004-AQMA in place since 2007.

Driving styles greatly impact on the amount of pollutants and emissions emitted from a vehicle. Generally speaking if a car is being driven at its most efficient then the impact on the environment is at its lowest. Regular acceleration and breaking increases fuel consumption and the amount of pollutants emitted. Dispersion of pollutants is less effective when traffic is moving slowly. Higher concentrations of pollutants causes lower air quality and potentially negative impacts on people's health. Generally speaking lower speeds result in more pollutants being emitted by vehicles; until speeds of over 60 mph are reached in which case levels of pollutants emitted begins to rise again.

Please see Appendix 1 for a copy of the Power Point presentation containing the graphs modelling various air quality scenarios in relation to different traffic speeds and types.

3.3b The panel thanked Sam for his presentation.

3.3c Members of the panel noted that there is a need to take into consideration both the road safety aspects of speed reduction as well as the potential increases in pollution and lower air quality, and that this may be a difficult balance to strike.

3.3d The panel heard that the graphs included in the presentation are based on models predicting worst case scenarios, and that the speeds were calculated based on traffic travelling at a constant speed, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The panel also heard that at much higher speeds, pollutants and emissions emitted by vehicles increase slightly.

3.3e Members of the panel noted that the evidence suggested that smooth moving traffic appeared to have the least impact on the environment

and that if 20 mph speed limits were introduced then there is the likelihood of re-directing traffic on to busy corridors which may be part of the AQMA. Careful consideration needed to be taken around implementing speed reductions and traffic management needed to be considered as part of any speed reduction scheme.

- 3.3f Members of the panel asked what the percentage difference in pollutants emitted is between a vehicle travelling at 30 mph and 20 mph. And, if a model was introduced into the city whereby residential roads alone were reduced to 20 mph and major roads left at 30 mph, would this impact on air quality in the city.
- 3.3g The panel heard that air quality is effected by speed which is dependent on a variety of factors, such as comparable driving speeds and styles. In simplistic terms by reducing the speed of a vehicle, the efficiency of a vehicle is reduced and journey times are increased, and this will all effect emissions. There are also other factors to consider such as how pollution is dispersed, and the displacement of traffic. However, it should also be noted that anything which makes it less easy to use a car and to encourage people to use more sustainable forms of transport is likely to improve air quality.
- 3.3h Members of the panel considered that for areas of the city, such as Lewes Road, if 20 mph speed limits were introduced on all side and residential roads off Lewes Road then there may be less traffic on the residential roads but more on Lewes Road itself, but as this may encourage more people to walk and cycle, then traffic on Lewes Road may reduce.
- 3.3i Members of the panel heard that a slight reduction in car traffic is unlikely to change air quality on Lewes Road.
- 3.3j The panel were informed that the difference between driving at 20 mph and 30 mph on air quality is dependent on the proportion of heavy vehicles on the roads, but could be estimated as being about a 4 or 5% difference in air quality. The panel should note that this difference may be enough to take air quality levels over the standards advised by current legislation.
- 3.3k Members of the panel noted that it was interesting to hear that the biggest contributors to air pollution are heavy duty vehicles; such as buses, coaches and trucks. The contribution from cars to air pollution varies around the city and is expected to be highest on heavily trafficked arterial routes where counts of heavy vehicles are less than 3% of the total.
- 3.3l The panel thanked Sam Rouse and Tim Nichols for their time and contributions.

3.4a Evidence from John Stewart, Chair of the UK Noise Association (UKNA)

The UKNA is a lobbying group which is concerned with all aspects of noise and its influence on people's quality of life. It is estimated that 12 million people in the UK are disturbed by traffic noise; this is approximately one fifth of the population. The problem of traffic noise is also getting worse. To date there has been little work done in the UK about the impacts and costs of high levels of noise. Research conducted in the Netherlands, however, suggests that noise can cause chronic health problems and stress. The cost of noise for the European Union was as much as €40 billion in 2007. It is reasonable, therefore, to assume that the cost of noise to local authority areas is high.

There is a measurable link between the speed of traffic and noise. If a vehicle is travelling between 20 mph and 30 mph and speed is reduced by 6 mph then noise can be cut by 40%. Therefore, reducing the default speed limit from 30 mph to 20 mph would help to reduce noise by well over 50%. Reducing the speed of traffic is hugely significant to reducing the levels of noise on roads, it is not only the fastest way of reducing noise but it is also the most equitable.

For many residents, the main roads in a city are their residential streets. Those residents living on main roads are often more deprived than those living in residential areas, and more likely to rate traffic noise as being one of their biggest concerns; bigger than crime. Introducing 20 mph on residential roads is likely to increase dispersion of traffic onto main roads and make main roads noisier. It is important, therefore, to consider reducing traffic speeds on main roads as well as residential roads, and to introduce a blanket reduction in speed limits in the city to 20 mph.

Traffic calming measures can help to reduce overall noise levels on roads. However, for those residents living directly next to a calming measure, such as a speed bump, noise levels may increase. Any traffic calming measures implemented should be purpose built for the road and use the most up-to-date technology; then they may help to reduce noise.

It should also be noted that in-car speed limiters, which prevent traffic from exceeding the speed limit, are currently being developed and are likely to be a useful bit of technology as they force vehicles to drive within speed limits, which will reduce noise levels.

It may appear that reducing noise through reducing speed limits is in conflict with air quality standards; however, if you reduce traffic speeds you are likely to bring about a modal shift in road use and encourage more people to walk and cycle. People often say that the biggest deterrent to walking and cycling is speeding traffic. The more people walking and cycling, the fewer vehicles there will be on the road

emitting pollution, and the more improvements to air quality will be seen.

- 3.4b The panel thanked John for his presentation.
- 3.4c Members of the panel asked if it is the increase in volume of traffic that has caused the increase in noise levels on roads and whether modern technology has had an impact on noise emitted by traffic.
- 3.4d The panel heard that technology has developed and the noise from vehicle engines has reduced considerably. There is, however, still a problem with the tyres of many vehicles. A recent new tyre directive from the European Union means that new guidelines should have a significant impact on the noise emitted from vehicle tyres. However, regardless of the improvement in technology, average noise levels on average streets in the UK are higher because there is more traffic on the roads.
- 3.4e Members of the panel were interested to know whether quieter cars could in fact contribute to more collisions as pedestrians will not hear them approaching.
- 3.4f Members of the panel heard that in general newer cars are much quieter, however, bicycles are also very quiet and pedestrians don't hear them either. However, if drivers have to drive slower because there are 20 mph speed limits then it is much less likely that pedestrians will be seriously or fatally injured if a collision was to occur. It is also, better to educate people to look out for quiet cars if it means that benefits can be realised for overall quality of life and well-being.
- 3.4g Members of the panel asked for a clarification on the impact of high noise levels on people's health.
- 3.4h The panel heard that noise impacts on people in different ways, some people will live on busy streets all their lives and perceive themselves not to be affected by noise, but will actually have higher levels of body stress they just won't be conscious of it, whilst others will complain of high levels of stress, have heart problems, and suffer from depression. The impact of high noise levels is not necessarily obvious, but the emerging evidence is making all of this much clearer.
- 3.4i Members of the panel noted that it is definitely more difficult to engage with and have conversations with residents living on busy streets.
- 3.4j The panel heard that lots of work has been conducted in America to demonstrate that those living on busy streets are less likely to interact with neighbours and even other family members.

- 3.4k Members of the panel noted that the evidence appeared to be suggesting that there was a definite tension between increasing air quality and reducing noise levels.
- 3.4l Members of the panel heard that this could be the case, unless a modal shift is achieved and that traffic is reduced and more people walk and cycle. Whilst there may appear to be some tension in noise levels and air quality, they are not at opposite ends of the spectrum. If road surfaces are maintained and tyres are improved then this can contribute to reducing noise and more efficient vehicle movement i.e. lower emissions. Defra is in the process of mapping noise levels across the country and, in consultation with stakeholders, will be producing local noise reduction action plans. There may be an opportunity for feeding lower speed limits into the action plans as a tool to reducing noise in local areas.
- 3.5a **The panel members, witnesses, and officers present held a general discussion around the issues raised by the evidence given.**
- 3.5b The panel heard from Phil Clarke, the Road Safety Manager at Brighton & Hove City Council, that identifying the need to reduce speed on various roads in the city is being done as part of the non A and B roads speed limit review. There are indications that there are some roads in the city where a 20 mph speed limit would be well complied with as traffic is already moving at relatively slow speeds during the day due to the nature of the road, although speeds may be less likely to be adhered to during the night time. Additionally, the council has a policy of encouraging a modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport, and such a policy supports noise reductions and improvements to air quality, but it should be noted that there are some people that will always need to bring their vehicles into the city.
- 3.5c Members of the panel noted this final point but also considered that most days, 67% of traffic movements start and end in the city whilst only about a third of traffic comes from outside the city.
- 3.5d Members of the panel asked if different road surfaces could have an impact on traffic.
- 3.5e The panel were informed that if road surfaces are very smooth and use high quality asphalt, when coupled with high tech tyres, then road surfaces can contribute to making cars more efficient; which results in a 'win, win' for noise, air quality and transport. Furthermore the smoothest roads are more attractive to slim-tire road cyclists. High quality road surfaces using the best available technology and materials are more expensive. However greater durability and resistance to freeze-thaw is likely to save money in the long run because annual road-patching and hole filling would not be necessary. Frequent road

mending causes disruption to public and private road transport and introduces additional congestion.

- 3.5f Members of the panel noted that there are many factors which may contribute to increasing road safety, for example, 20 mph speed signs designed by children help to slow traffic, and using different road surfaces to make drivers aware that they are entering an area where there are concentrations of vulnerable road users can induce drivers to slow down. In Stanford ward there is a 20 mph zone which is traffic calmed through the use of signs and humps and raised platforms, and an area which is traffic calmed uses different road surfaces. Many residents appear to dislike the speed humps, but few complain about the alternative road surface which appears to be effective at slowing traffic down.
- 3.5g The discussions were drawn to a conclusion and the witnesses thanked for their time and contributions. It was agreed that the witnesses would be asked to provide some further written evidence to back up the evidence they had given.

4 Dates of future meetings of the panel were confirmed as:

- 4.1 26 January 2010, at 10 am, Lecture Room, Friends' Meeting House
11 February 2010, at 10 am, Committee Room 3, Brighton Town Hall
23 February 2010, at 10 am, Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall

5 Any other business

- 5.1 None.

The meeting concluded at 11.40.

APPENDIX 3B: MINUTES OF PANEL'S PUBLIC MEETING: 26/01/2010

**Brighton and Hove City Council
Environment and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Ad Hoc Panel – 20 mph speed limits/zones**

**10.00 am 26 January 2010
Minutes**

Present: Councillors West (Chairman), Wells, Bennett, Watkins

Also present: Roger French, Peter Salvage, Stephen Young, Phil Clarke, Libby Young

Apologies: Councillor Mitchell

Part One

6 Procedural business

6a Declaration of substitutes

6.1 Substitutes are not allowed on Scrutiny Panels.

6b Declaration of interest

6.2 Please refer to the minutes of the panel's meeting on 19 January 2010. No further declarations of interest were made.

6c Declaration of party whip

6.3 There were none.

6d Exclusion of press and public

6.4 In accordance with section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, it was considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if the members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in section 100I of the said Act.

6.5 **Resolved** – That the press and public are not excluded from the meeting.

7 Chairman's communications

7.1 The Chairman passed on Cllr Gill Mitchell's apologies.

- 7.2 All those present were welcomed and introductions took place. The chairman thanked everyone for their involvement, particularly the witnesses and officers for taking the time to attend the public meeting and for being involved in the evidence gathering process.
- 7.3 It was noted that the final witness on the agenda from Portsmouth City Council was unable to attend today's meeting or any future meetings of the 20 mph scrutiny panel. An officer involved in implementing the scheme in Portsmouth has, however, agreed to try to answer as many of the panel's questions as possible via email.
- 7.4 For the benefit of all attendees the purpose of the scrutiny review was reiterated as: to investigate the effects of reducing the speed limit in some residential and built-up areas of the city to 20 mph. Speed reduction initiatives could include either redesigning roads within the city to include traffic calming measures, or simply reducing the default speed limit on roads to 20 mph through the use of signs only.
- 7.5 The format of the meeting was outlined, and it was noted that as members of the public are invited to apply to give verbal evidence to the panel at the panel's fourth and final meeting, or to submit written comments, there was no time allocated at this meeting for members of the public to ask questions or make points.
- 7.6 The panel agreed to proceed as outlined by the Chairman.
- 7.7 It was noted that the minutes from the previous meeting of the scrutiny panel are not yet available; however, every effort will be made to ensure that the minutes from this meeting and the previous meeting of the panel will be available before the panel's third meeting. It was noted that an amended biography for one of the speakers had been circulated at the beginning of the meeting.
- 7.8 The panel were reminded of the sample questions for the witnesses which had been circulated prior to the meeting and that they could refer to them when questioning the witnesses. The panel asked the witnesses if they could answer as many of the questions as possible as part of their presentations and submit to the panel, after the meeting, written answers to the sample questions.
- 7.9 Members of the panel requested that future meetings of the panel should take place in buildings where a hearing loop is available.

8 Evidence from the witnesses

- 8.2 The panel heard evidence from a number of witnesses.
- 8.2a **Evidence from Roger French, Managing Director, Brighton and Hove Bus Company**

There are a number of implications for bus services in the city of introducing a blanket 20 mph speed limit, and the bus company has a number of concerns about this particular approach. The bus company is supportive of introducing 20 mph speed limits where there are very particular reasons and evidence for introducing such a limit; indeed 20 mph speed limits in specific areas can work successfully. However, the bus company is deeply concerned that a blanket approach to 20 mph speed limits would be counter intuitive.

There are several points which can be made to illustrate the concerns which the bus company has with a blanket approach to 20 mph speed limits. It would cause longer journey times for buses and therefore to maintain the current bus network and timetables it would cost more to run. For example, currently a round trip from Patcham/Hollingbury to Hangleton via the city centre can take about two hours allowing for unexpected delays and some slack time at either end of the journey for the bus to rest. The current timetable runs every five minutes so 12 buses are required to run the service in one direction and therefore 24 in total to manage this route. If a 20 mph speed limit was introduced then it is going to take longer than the current time allocated including the slack time also factored in. So, the bus company will either have to introduce more buses to run the current service as it is, or instead of running a service every five minutes, it will have to run, say, every eight minutes.

Increased journey times brought about by 20 mph speed restrictions are likely to have an impact on some bus services, in particular some of those currently supported by the council. To maintain an hourly service for some routes instead of using two buses, the bus company would need to put on four buses or change the frequency of the buses from hourly to every 70 minutes. However, this will cause problems for bus passengers who will find it difficult to judge what time buses are supposed to arrive if they do not run at the same time every hour. This change in bus times will not encourage more people to use public transport. If a 20 mph speed limit is introduced across the city, the bus company will have to consider either operating a reduced level of service or a 10% increase in ticket prices in order to factor in the increase in journey time for the buses.

There is an argument for introducing lower speed limits in order to increase road safety, and the bus company assumes that this is the reason that 20 mph is being suggested. The bus company in Oxford is currently navigating the impact of a large area of Oxford City being restricted to 20 mph speed limits. Their experience of widespread 20 mph speed limits so far is that it has increased conflict between cyclists and buses. In order to keep to the 20 mph speed limit, the buses in Oxford are running at speeds of about 15 - 17 mph, which is the same speed which cyclists are moving at. As a result, cyclists and buses are finding themselves competing for road space and having to constantly overtake each other.

There is clear evidence to suggest that vehicles travelling at speeds of 20 mph will reduce the risks to pedestrians of being fatally injured in a collision. Indeed the current 20 mph speed restrictions on Western Road, Montpelier Road, North Street and the Old Steine and the exclusive bus lanes in this 3 mile corridor have resulted in no fatal collisions since they have been introduced, although there have been some minor incidents. The bus company is completely supportive of these kinds of speed restrictions as there were very particular reasons for introducing them. The bus company would also support the use of 20 mph speed limits in high risk areas such as schools, and where there is evidence that such a speed restriction would benefit pedestrian safety.

Most injuries caused by buses are to bus passengers rather than pedestrians or other road users, and these injuries are not the result of the speed of the bus but instead are caused by the mobility of bus passengers or driver error.

The enforcement of 20 mph speed limits is also of great concern. In some areas of the city where there are already 20 mph speed limits bus drivers will comply with this speed limit but other road users regularly do not. Sussex Police do not have the resources to enforce current road laws, for example, the use of bus lanes for buses only, was only enforced when the council took over the enforcement of these. If 20 mph speed restrictions introduced into the city are not enforced then they will not be complied with which causes problems for buses.

There is a risk that fuel consumption will increase if buses have to drive at a lower speed. The bus company in Oxford is currently investigating ways to 'fine tune' the buses engines and gear boxes and this may help, but there are costs involved in doing this.

Lastly, if residents are being encouraged to get out of their cars and use public transport, introducing a blanket 20 mph speed limit across the city will not enable the bus company to run a service that will appeal to residents. This is not to say that the bus company is against 20 mph speed limits where there are clear reasons for introducing them, as was the case around St Peter's Church; and where there are risks for pedestrians, putting in 20 mph speed restrictions are worth introducing. However there are many factors which contribute to a road collision, such as pedestrians failing to look before they cross the road, which will still occur regardless of the speed of traffic.

- 8.2b The panel thanked Roger for his presentation and members of the panel asked what the average speeds of the buses are as they travel around the city.

- 8.2c The panel heard that it varies widely in the city from an average of about 20 – 27 mph, depending on the roads. For example, in Portland Road buses reach an average of 23 mph, Lewes Road: 29 mph, Ditchling Road: 18 mph, New Church Road: 27 mph, and Elm Grove: 19 mph.
- 8.2d Members of the panel commented that the experience of Oxford's bus company in managing the recent introduction of widespread 20 mph speed limits in the city was of interest, and that any extra information, particularly around fuel consumption and the issue of conflict between buses and cyclists, which could be provided would be most useful.
- 8.2e The panel heard that the bus company in Oxford was trying to alter the maximum efficiency of their bus fleet in order to make the buses operate more efficiently in a 20 mph context; currently buses operate most efficiently in a 30 mph speed limit.
- 8.2f Members of the panel noted that when making recommendations about a potential model for a 20 mph scheme for the city they would need to consider that it may contribute to increasing the number of buses on the road without necessarily the benefit of an increase in the bus service or passenger numbers, and that this may contribute to increases in traffic congestion in the city.
- 8.2g The panel heard that the bus company operates at any one time 230 buses, and that to maintain services in a 20 mph context, 23 more buses would need to be out on the roads, which would contribute to congestion, although buses are not responsible for causing current congestion in the city.
- 8.2h Members of the panel asked if they could have a breakdown of average speeds attained by buses in the city, as this would help them to understand the impact that a blanket approach to 20 mph would have, particularly on arterial roads.
- 8.2i It was agreed that some figures could be provided, although members of the panel should be aware that average speeds will hide extreme speeds on a road.
- 8.2j Members of the panel asked if 20 mph speed restrictions were introduced into parts of the city which resulted in pockets of 20 mph speed limits, would it mean that the bus company would move some of their bus routes onto other roads.
- 8.2k Members of the panel heard that this would be dependent on how the speed limit is implemented. The bus company is not against pockets of 20 mph if they are well researched and there are reasons for them. However, excessive signage and, in particular, speed humps cause problems for the buses, although chicanes in some circumstances can

work. It really does depend upon whatever model is implemented as to whether bus routes and services would change.

- 8.2l Members of the panel noted that one possible model would be to introduce 20 mph speed limits through just signage and no physical measures, on just residential streets. In such a model arterial roads would remain at 30 mph. This is a model which other cities have been adopting.
- 8.2m Members of the panel heard that keeping arterial routes at 30 mph would be considered by the bus company as a sensible approach, although it depends on what definition of arterial is being used. There are some roads in the city which are not arterial but having a 20 mph speed restriction in place would make little sense. There is also the problem that if just signage is introduced and the 20 mph speed limit is not enforced in some way then many road users will simply not comply with the speed limit.
- 8.2n Members of the panel noted that there are different areas of the city which are used in different ways. For example, the seafront route is a major thorough fare dominated by vehicles, there are areas of the city where pedestrians are the main road users, and then there is the rest of the city which is used in equal measures by a variety of road users. It is the shared areas of the city which need careful consideration.
- 8.2o Members of the panel heard that this was a fair assessment, however, they were asked, in such a model where would the main spinal roads fit? Spinal routes are not defined as arterial roads, but they are key roads which keep traffic moving throughout the city. Additionally if 20 mph speed limits are implemented in residential areas, there will be no one to enforce it. Unless speed limits are enforced then any scheme introduced is unlikely to be a success.
- 8.2p Another witness asked if the average speed of buses given earlier was whilst the buses were in motion or if they were speeds for average bus journeys? Bus journeys can be reduced by reducing the stoppage time of buses which can be aided by introducing alternative ticketing systems such as the oyster card scheme in London.
- 8.2q The panel heard that the average speeds of the buses given, were whilst the bus was in motion and that alternative ticketing systems may reduce bus stoppage times.
- 8.2r The panel thanked Roger French for his time and contributions.
- 8.2s Roger French informed the panel that he had to leave the meeting early but his colleague Peter Salvage, Operations Manager, would remain for the rest of the meeting to participate in the discussions.

8.3a **Evidence from Phil Clarke, Road Safety Manager, Brighton & Hove City Council**

Having previously provided information on the data on road collisions in Brighton and Hove at the scoping meeting for the panel, the evidence provided today is aimed at addressing the points which arose from the scoping meeting. Please may members of the panel refer to the briefing pack provided which contains more detail about average traffic speeds and 20 mph zones in the city.

It should be noted at this stage that the data related to 20 mph zones is problematic due to the often staged approach which is taken with their implementation. It is difficult, therefore, to precisely understand the impact of 20 mph schemes in the city. Additionally, on a technical note, the collision data associated with 20 mph zones is incomplete as the readily searchable collision database only dates back to 2001, and many 20 mph zones date back to earlier than that. The pack which has been provided contains information about some examples of the schemes in Brighton and Hove.

Point 1 – average speeds in the city – information and data (if available) i.e. – do vehicles manage to hit speeds of 30 mph on roads in the city/residential areas currently?

There are residential streets in the city where speeds of 30 mph plus are achieved. However, the speed of traffic on a road is dependent on the nature of the road, and average speeds need to be analysed on a road by road basis in order to understand what average speeds are in the city. This is why there is currently a citywide speed limit review being undertaken on all non A and B roads in the city in order to understand what speeds in the city are. The table included in table 1.2 of the briefing pack demonstrates some of the average speeds achieved in Poets Corner both before and after a traffic intervention. It is clear that by looking at some of the percentages that some of the streets were being used as rat runs before a scheme was implemented.

Point 2 – more information about the PBA speed limit review (timetable, objectives, methodology, outcomes etc)

The current PBA speed limit review is being done off the back of a mandatory review which all local authorities were required to undertake. This review into all non A and B roads is being conducted through the use of clusters of similar demographics. 22 clusters have been identified and collision data has been overlaid on these in order to enable a priority list of clusters to be produced. Other features will be overlaid on to these clusters such as schools, playgrounds, and shopping areas. Each cluster will then have speed surveys undertaken, aerial mapping, and observational studies. From the speed limit review we expect that a series of recommendations for suitable speed limits

on roads in the city will be produced. It will then have to be decided as to whether the recommendations are implemented or not.

In the previous mandatory speed limit review of all A and B roads, all the recommendations bar one were accepted in principle, and the only exception was a recommendation to raise the speed limit from 40 mph to 50 mph on the road near to Falmer (A270) station. This didn't feel appropriate in light of the road works being undertaken in relation to the stadium. Most recommendations were to maintain the current speed limits, and there were a few recommendations for speed reductions. From the current ongoing speed limit review, we are expecting that there may be some recommendations for reducing speed limits in some residential areas, particularly around schools. The current speed limit review will take about a year to complete. Those clusters where there have been the most number of accidents will be prioritised first.

Please note the table under section 2.11 of your pack, which details how average speeds are measured in relation to setting speed limits. Average speeds of 24 mph need to exist on a road before a 20 mph speed limit is introduced. Any average speed above this is unlikely to be self enforcing and therefore a 20 mph limit is unlikely to be complied with.

Point 3 – what is the current approach towards resolving and listening to demands from residents for calming/lower speeds, especially beyond the Safer Routes to School Programme (i.e. current protocols and feedback mechanisms etc)

Please refer to Appendix A of the briefing pack for the council's traffic calming policy. Please note that collision data is also considered when deciding whether traffic calming is suitable for a particular area. The road safety team at the council continuously assess and analyses the data to see where initiatives could be undertaken to reduce collisions. What the road safety team has found is that often when applications for traffic calming are made there is a perception that traffic is speeding; however, when officers are sent out to conduct speed surveys speeding is not always a problem. For example, officers were asked to introduce 20 mph on St Nicholas Road outside St Pauls C of E Primary School. When site visits were undertaken there were found to be low traffic volumes and no cars travelling above 18 mph. On Hangleton Way, average speeds outside two schools were found to be 16 mph. The main issue identified by officers undertaking site visits and speed surveys was congestion and inconsiderate parking by parents that led to an impression of speed and chaos.

Point 4 – historical information on existing 20 mph zones in the city

Please refer to your briefing packs for more historical information about 20 mph zones in the city.

Point 5 – the scope of implementation of 20 mph zones in Brighton and Hove currently (information about the timetable, funding and availability etc)

There is no traffic calming programme as such currently being undertaken but there is a priority list of sites and this is contained in Appendix E of your packs.

The costs of engineering measures are difficult to pin down. The scheme introduced into Hartington Road cost approximately £190,000, in 1997. If traffic calming measures were introduced into all 22 of the clusters identified as part of the speed limit review it would cost approximately £500,000 per cluster and £11 million in total. Please note these figures are very approximate. If a signs only approach to speed reduction was introduced into all 22 clusters than this would cost approx. £40,000 per cluster, and £880,000 in total. Please note these are only estimated costs, and are conservative estimates.

There is much evidence to suggest that 20 mph speed limits, when introduced with traffic calming measures, help to slow vehicles down. There is, however, no data to suggest that there is a direct link between 20 mph speed limits and increases in cycling and walking. It should also be noted that 20 mph limits and zones introduced in one road may have knock on displacement effects for other roads, for example, move more traffic on to arterial roads, or encourage rat running on other roads. 20 mph speed limits may just move some traffic problems around the city rather than solve all of them.

- 8.3b The panel thanked Phil for his evidence and the pack of information which he had put together for them.
- 8.3c Members of the panel were asked to note that the clusters identified as part of the PBA review are different sizes, with different routes inside of them, and that engineering measures have improved with time and newer measures introduced are likely to be more effective.
- 8.3d Members of the panel asked if the way the council currently decides whether areas of the city are ideal for traffic calming measures is effective, and if the council was to reduce the default speed limit surely drivers would comply with it; people adjust their behaviours and driving speeds according to what the rules are so if the default speed limit is adjusted people will comply. It is simply a case of drawing people's attention to the speed limits in place.
- 8.3e Members of the panel were informed that this is not always the case. Often when speed limits are introduced without enforcement measures they are not complied with. Additionally, it can cause the displacement of traffic and rat running in other areas of the city.

- 8.3f Members of the panel noted that often when drivers emerge from a speed limit they will accelerate rapidly. This is likely to apply to 20 mph speed limits and 20 mph zones where they boarder with 30 mph speed limits. Accelerating traffic could pose a danger to other road users.
- 8.3g These comments were agreed with and members of the panel were asked to note that part of the issue the city currently faces is that the city has islands of 20 mph zones and that they are not joined up. Also, part of the problem is that there is not a culture of slow driving in the city so drivers need to be forced to slow down. One of things that can be done to address this is to keep the arterial routes in the city reasonably free flowing. If traffic is kept moving drivers are less likely to become frustrated with sitting in traffic and less likely to turn off and rat run. It is also important to keep the spinal routes of the city moving at a reasonable speed.
- 8.3h Members of the panel commented that if the roads liable to rat running were also included in a speed reduction scheme then this would avoid drivers rat running off of arterial roads and through residential areas. There are also other measures which can be undertaken, such as the scheme on St Johns road where a green pathway has been installed on the road for pedestrians to use as there is no pavement. This clearly identifies the road as being a mixed use, shared road and appears to have slowed traffic down.
- 8.3i Members of the panel also noted that whilst the average speeds of traffic may be low on some roads, it will hide the odd driver which speeds through roads much faster. There is a need to introduce a culture of slower driving into the city.
- 8.3j The panels comments were acknowledged but the panel were asked to note that it will be difficult to achieve a culture of slower driving just from introducing 20 mph signs only. If it is made difficult for drivers to speed through the use of traffic calming measures than this forces drivers to slow down.
- 8.3k The panel thanked Phil Clarke for his time and contributions.

8.4a **Evidence from Stephen Young, a Local Supporter of Living Streets**

The most important benefit of 20 mph speed limits is that they cut deaths and injuries. However, 20 mph is also the key to unlocking other benefits. There is evidence from other cities in the UK, such as Portsmouth, and from the rest of Europe that 20 mph speed limits are hugely beneficial to increasing resident's quality of life and well-being.

The original 30 mph speed limit was introduced in 1934 when there were only 2 million cars on the road; today there are 28 million cars. If the leading cause of deaths in the UK is considered for various age

groups; for those aged 5-9 and 10-14, it is being hit by a vehicle and for those aged 15-35 the leading cause of death is being in a motor vehicle accident. 49% of drivers admit to regularly 'driving significantly above' the current 30 mph speed limit in built-up areas. It is known that if as a pedestrian you get hit by a car travelling at 20 mph there is a 97% chance of survival. Being hit by a car at 35 mph there is a 50% chance of surviving. Where there is a risk of collisions occurring it is worth introducing a 20 mph speed limit. However, as where the risks actually are is hard to identify, and arguably risks are everywhere as people are very bad at judging risks, 20 mph should be implemented on all roads.

Evidence from Hull illustrates the huge impact which 20 mph zones, with traffic calming measures, can have on reducing deaths and casualties. A recent study from the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine also illustrates the impact which 20 mph zones have had on road casualties in London.

As well as improvements in road safety, slower speeds can bring about other benefits; such as, better health, increased sociability, less noise, better walking and cycling conditions and hence more active travel. A report from the Commission for Integrated Transport indicated that where cities have 20 mph speed limits covering between 65% and 85% of their street network, cities are transformed from being noisy polluted places into vibrant people-centred environments. A study undertaken in Bristol also indicated that reduced traffic speeds encourage more sociability between neighbours and local communities. Reduced speeds also avoid cars accelerating and braking which reduces noise created by traffic. Introducing a blanket approach to 20 mph will further aid the reduction of traffic noise as traffic will be more likely to travel at a constant speed rather than accelerating and braking between 'islands' of 20 mph. Lastly, many people do not currently cycle or walk because of fear of speeding traffic. It is the fear factor which stops people from engaging in active travel. Britain's default speed limit is 60% higher than speed limits in European cities. European cities also have more cyclists and walkers and less problems with obesity.

The government's climate change adviser (David MacKay) has written that if the country wants to reduce climate change emissions from traffic then traffic has to go further between stops, move slower and move less. When 19 mph zones were introduced in Germany, car drivers on average; had to change gear 12% less often, use their brakes 14% less often and required 12% less fuel. Introducing a default 20 mph speed limit rather than islands of 20 mph speed limits or zones will aid traffic in moving smoothly and therefore reduce pollution and emissions.

Currently in Brighton and Hove, 20 mph zones are inconsistent, patchworky, and result in a 'postcode lottery' for residents, with some residents living in areas of 20 mph zones and others in 30 mph speed

limits. The cost of introducing 20 mph zones is substantially more than introducing a default 20 mph speed limit; a 20 mph speed limit is cheaper and quicker to install as only signs are needed.

Enforcement is not always needed to change behaviour and culture, and when it comes to the carrot versus the stick, the latter cannot be relied on all the time, a culture of slower driving needs to be developed and a default 20 mph speed limit will aid this. 20 mph default speed limits are also no longer a theoretical debate; Portsmouth City Council has introduced them. In Brighton and Hove we need more sensible sharing of roads, not all pedestrians are drivers, but all drivers are pedestrians at some point in their day. Nationally, there is a lot of support for 20 mph; it creates safe, attractive and enjoyable streets. A 20 mph speed limit is a straight forward solution to addressing a number of local issues, there is no single policy which could achieve the same benefits so quickly and for such a modest financial investment for the council.

- 8.4b The panel thanked Stephen for his presentation.
- 8.4c Members of the panel noted that from the examples taken from Europe and used in the presentation it would be interesting to know what the cities' former speed limits were, for comparison purposes. Members of the panel asked for clarification on which model of speed limits in Brighton and Hove would provide most benefits for residents.
- 8.4d Members of the panel heard that the New Road development provided an interesting example of behavioural change in the city. Many traders were against the speed restrictions and the alterations at first, however, now the traders are very supportive of the way the road is used and the culture of the road has been completely transformed, becoming attractive for non-motorised road users. We need more schemes like the New Road scheme in Brighton and Hove, and the schemes need to be better joined up. Roads like the seafront road where traffic speeds along, and yet borders on the most visited tourist destination in the city – the seafront – need to be made friendlier towards other road users, not just motorised traffic. The whole city, may be with some exceptions, should operate under a default 20 mph speed limit. Including arterial roads in a 20 mph scheme would not necessarily be problematic as there are other ways of dealing with, for example, increased bus journey times through reducing bus stopping times. A model similar to the approach taken by Portsmouth, which has introduced a default 20 mph speed limit, with a few exceptions, should be introduced into Brighton and Hove.
- 8.4e Members of the panel noted that it was unfortunate that a representative from Portsmouth had been unable to attend the meetings, but that every effort would be made to find out more about the model which Portsmouth has used and the benefits realised.

- 8.5a **Members of the panel and the witnesses present held a general discussion around the issues raised by the evidence given.**
- 8.5b Members of the panel were asked to note that whilst there have been some indications that the scheme introduced in Portsmouth has been successful, there is only one years worth of data available, and three or four years of data is needed in order to draw conclusions from the scheme. Additionally, there were a number of other measures introduced in the Portsmouth scheme as well as a speed limit reduction such as cul-de-sacs, changes to parking, and one way streets. It would be interesting to know from Portsmouth if these measures have had an impact on the overall scheme introduced. Early indications from Portsmouth are encouraging, but it should be noted that the demographics of the city are quite different, and the results from the scheme need to be carefully teased apart, with the effectiveness of the 20 mph limit from the other measures introduced distilled out.
- 8.5c Members of the panel were also asked to consider that there are other examples beyond Portsmouth where lessons can be learnt from, many cities in Europe have lower speed limits such as Copenhagen and Barcelona. The quality of life in these cities is measurably better than in the UK. Introducing a 20 mph speed limit is an incredibly cost effective way of creating increases in quality of life for residents.
- 8.5d Members of the panel noted that whilst speed reductions may encourage better quality of life, there are other factors which need to also be weighed into the equation such as the slowing down of traffic which may lead to more pollution.
- 8.5e The panel were informed that this is not necessarily the case as slower speeds may contribute to a modal shift in road use away from the car to more sustainable forms of transport. It was also suggested that the emissions implications of speed reductions are based on data collected under track conditions. Travelling at 20 mph, traffic tends to move more smoothly as there is less braking and less acceleration and therefore fewer pollutants are emitted. Studies in Germany have shown that lower speeds mean that on average; car drivers changed gear 12% less often, used their brakes 14% less often and used 12% less fuel.
- 8.5f Members of the panel asked if introducing other measures such as more pedestrian crossings would be more effective than reducing the speed limit.
- 8.5g The panel were informed that pedestrian crossings would be much more expensive to introduce. For example, the last crossing installed in the city cost about £65,000
- 8.5h Members of the panel noted that the scheme in Portsmouth is of great use in trying to understand the implications of a citywide 20 mph speed limit. Members of the panel noted that it would be interesting to know

from Portsmouth City Council as to which criteria was used to decide what roads were reduced to 20 mph, the background thinking behind the scheme and how they reached their decision to implement the 20 mph scheme which they did.

- 8.5i It was asked as to whether introducing such widespread 20 mph speed limits might have potential negative economic impacts.
- 8.5j Members of the panel heard that it would potentially have a positive economic impact as the city would receive more visitors as the city would become renowned for being a safe and attractive place to visit. It should also be considered that the cost of each road collision on the public purse is huge. It is estimated that the cost to the UK of traffic collisions is £18 billion every year. The average cost of a road traffic accident in 2008 was £59,000 and for a fatal accident, when all costs are factored in, it could cost the economy an estimated £1.27 million. The cost of every road collision to the emergency services is high. For example the Fire and Rescue service now spend more of their time dealing with road collisions than fires. Lastly, the costs to the health service which could be prevented by introducing a default 20 mph speed limit and thereby reducing obesity and other health complications as more people participate in active travel need to be factored in.
- 8.5k Members of the panel noted that it would be interesting to know if Portsmouth and Oxford have park and ride schemes, and if there have been changes in the use of these services since the introduction of 20 mph speed limits.
- 8.5l The discussions were drawn to a conclusion and the witnesses thanked for their time and contributions. It was agreed that the witnesses would be asked to provide some further written evidence to back up the evidence they had given.

9 Dates of future meetings of the panel were confirmed as:

- 9.1 11 February 2010, at 10 am, Committee Room 3, Brighton Town Hall
23 February 2010, at 10 am, Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall

10 Any other business

- 10.1 None.

The meeting concluded at 11.50.

APPENDIX 3C: MINUTES OF PANEL'S PUBLIC MEETING: 11/02/2010

**Brighton and Hove City Council
Environment and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Ad Hoc Panel – 20 mph speed limits/zones**

**10.00 am 11 February 2010
Minutes**

Present: Councillors West (Chairman), Wells, Watkins, Mitchell
Also present: Chris Grundy, Jack Hazelgrove, Tony Green, Libby Young
Apologies: Councillor Bennett

Part One

11 Procedural business

11a Declaration of substitutes

11.1 Substitutes are not allowed on Scrutiny Panels.

11b Declaration of interest

11.2 Please refer to the minutes of the panel's meeting on 19 January 2010.
No further declarations of interest were made.

11c Declaration of party whip

11.3 There were none.

11d Exclusion of press and public

11.4 In accordance with section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, it was considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if the members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in section 100I of the said Act.

11.5 **Resolved** – That the press and public are not excluded from the meeting.

12 Chairman's communications

12.1 The Chairman passed on Cllr Jayne Bennett's apologies.

12.2 The chairman asked members of the panel to note the minutes from the previous public meetings of the panel.

- 12.3 All of those present were welcomed and introductions took place. The chairman thanked everyone for their involvement, particularly the witnesses for taking the time to attend the public meeting and for being involved in the evidence gathering process.
- 12.4 For the benefit of all attendees the purpose of the scrutiny review was reiterated as: to investigate the effects of reducing the speed limit in some residential and built-up areas of the city to 20 mph. Speed reduction initiatives could include either redesigning roads within the city to include traffic calming measures, or simply reducing the default speed limit on roads to 20 mph through the use of signs only.
- 12.5 The format of the meeting was outlined, and it was noted that as members of the public are invited to apply to give verbal evidence to the panel at the panel's fourth and final meeting, or to submit comments, there was no time allocated at this meeting for members of the public to ask questions or make points.
- 12.6 The panel agreed to proceed as outlined by the chairman.
- 12.7 The panel were reminded of the sample questions for the witnesses which had been circulated prior to the meeting and that they could refer to them when questioning the witnesses. The panel asked the witnesses to answer as many of the questions as possible as part of their presentation.

13 Evidence from the witnesses

- 13.1 The panel heard evidence from a number of witnesses.

13.2a Evidence from Chris Grundy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

A recent study conducted by the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) and funded by Transport for London looked into the overall effect of 20 mph zones in London on road injuries and on whether 20 mph zones could be used to tackle inequalities in road injuries. The study consisted of three main stages: a literature review; a statistical analysis of all available data sets on 20 mph zones which included an analysis of the cost of 20 mph zones versus the number of lives saved; and a modelling of how much further benefit could be derived from introducing 20 mph zones in other areas. The effects of 20 mph speed limits were not included in the remit of this study.

The study looked at 20 mph zones which had been implemented in London over a 20 year period from 1986 to 2006. In total 399 20 mph zones in London were studied. The first 20 mph zone was introduced in 1991 in Kingston and the numbers of zones have increased steadily as

the guidelines over where they can be introduced has changed. By the end of the study period, in 2006, 11% of roads in London had 20 mph zones on them with 97% of these being on minor roads and only 3% on major roads. The 20 mph zones varied in size from some covering just 100 meters of road, whilst others covered up to 40km of road. As well as variations in the actual size of the 20 mph zones, there were marked differences in the take up of zones in different areas of London. For example Islington has used 20 mph zones extensively, whereas Kensington and Chelsea have had a policy of only introducing 20 mph zones on roads where there is significant evidence to suggest that it is warranted. The borough has yet to introduce any 20 mph zones within their area. Kingston and Chelsea have, however, trialled other techniques for slowing traffic down. The borough has widely adopted the concept of shared space and removed road markings, street clutter, and used other techniques which are also used extensively on the European continent to make the roads appear more unsafe to drivers which influences them to slow down.

The LSHTM study analysed the STATS19 Data which records; the date, location, number and type of casualties for all collisions which result in injury, the age, sex and background of those involved in an accident, the type of road user, as well as any extenuating circumstances. During the study's 20 year period there were 900,000 casualties and 6,000 deaths resulting from road collisions in London. Data was also collected on 20 mph zones, such as; where they were located, when they were installed, what measures were part of the zone, and how much the zone cost. Data on the 399 20 mph zones was incomplete and for only about 50% of the 20 mph zones introduced in London was all the data available.

The two data sets on road collisions and on 20 mph zones were mapped onto roads in London. Every road in London was categorised according to whether it was within a 20 mph zone, adjacent to a 20 mph zone (eg within 150 meters of a zone or on a junction with a zone) or outside of a 20 mph zone. The casualty data was then mapped on top of the zones data for every year in the 20 year period and a note was made as to whether casualties occurred before, during, or after the 20 mph zone was installed. Those roads which were outside of 20 mph zones acted as the study's control group. The control group provided useful indicators as to what was happening with road injury levels over the 20 years in comparison to those roads where 20 mph zones had been introduced.

The results of the study indicated that over the 20 year study period 20 mph zones were associated with a 42% reduction in all casualties. This was higher for killed and seriously injured casualties where there was a reduction of 46% in casualties, and for those killed and seriously injured aged between 0-15 there was a reduction of 50% in casualties. The largest reduction in casualties was in car occupants which were killed and seriously injured which saw a reduction in casualties of 62%.

Cyclists overall saw the smallest reduction in casualties associated with 20 mph zones of 17%, however, killed and seriously injured cyclist casualties saw a reduction of 38% in casualties.

The reductions in casualties associated with 20 mph zones did not vary across London or between areas of higher and lower deprivation nor did the impact of zones vary depending on the size of the 20 mph zone. The only slight changes found between 20 mph zones were over time. There was some evidence to suggest that the 20 mph zones implemented in the last 6 years of the data were less effective. This could be for a number of reasons; because 20 mph zones had already been installed in the high risk areas where large numbers of injuries were occurring; because there were other road safety issues occurring in these locations; or because there was a background reduction in casualties also occurring. Finally, areas adjacent to 20 mph zones also appeared to be associated with a reduction in casualties of 8% for all casualties and 10% for casualties involving young people. Whilst some areas adjacent to 20 mph zones experienced some migration of traffic this did not appear to be accompanied by increases in injury.

The study conducted by the LSHTM and published in the British Medical Journal in September 2009, concluded that 20 mph zones with traffic calming measures are a good tool for reducing casualties from road collisions. The LSHTM recommended that 20 mph zones should be used to target areas where there are large numbers of road injuries and that on residential roads surrounding the zones, 20 mph speed limits could also be brought in to further aid casualty reduction.

- 13.2b The panel thanked Chris for his evidence.
- 13.2c Members of the panel asked whether the size of 20 mph zones made a difference on their impact. For example were larger zones more or less effective than smaller zones and how did signage in different sized zones make a difference on the effectiveness of a zone. Members of the panel commented how the introduction of a shared surface into New Road in the centre of Brighton had forced road users to think differently about how they travel. Members of the panel asked if any comparative studies had been conducted on the effectiveness of shared surfaces versus 20 mph zones.
- 13.2d The panel heard that in the study conducted in London the size of 20 mph zones had not appeared to make a difference, and no differences were found between large zones introduced in 1996 and smaller zones introduced in the same year. The impact of signage on the effectiveness of 20 mph zones is difficult to judge as the data on various 20 mph zones was patchy and for many zones information about the extent of the measures introduced was incomplete. There is a signage standard for 20 mph zones, however, which means that entry and exit signs into a 20 mph zone are required but repeater signs are not. The only difference that the study did note in effectiveness

between zones was that the 20 mph zones which had been introduced more recently appeared to be less effective. This may be because the 20 mph zones introduced more recently tended to be bigger and there is less information for drivers about what the speed limit is, or there may be other reasons for the decrease in effectiveness.

In terms of shared surfaces no comparative studies have been conducted; however, Kensington and Chelsea have introduced shared surfaces and have found reductions in casualties. There is some suggestion, however, that road users are getting used to shared surfaces and as they become more familiar with the roads and less uncomfortable with the layout traffic speeds are increasing; and this is a result that 20 mph zones won't necessarily have as the traffic calming measures force drivers to travel at 20 mph. The evidence available suggests that shared surfaces do reduce injuries, however, perhaps not as much as 20 mph zones.

- 13.2e Members of the panel asked if the study in London had looked into the impacts of 20 mph zones on air quality.
- 13.2f The panel heard that the study had not directly, but this had been included in the lit review and that the information regarding the impact of slower speeds on air quality was very mixed with almost exactly the same amount of research stating that slower speeds has a positive impact as that stating that slower speeds has a negative impact. At its most basic level, a vehicle being driven at a constant speed is likely to produce less pollution while a vehicle which is constantly speeding up and slowing down will produce more.
- 13.2g Members of the panel asked what the speed limits were on the roads included in the study in London and whether there was any evidence that vehicles complied with these limits. Members of the panel also asked whether compliance with speed limits was better entering and exiting, and between 20 mph zones then that achieved by blanket 20 mph speed limits. Members of the panel also asked whether improvements in the technology of cars, for example in braking, was taken into account in the study, and whether the introduction of 20 mph zones in London had an impact on bus services and the efficiency of buses in London.
- 13.2h The panel heard that a control group of roads, i.e those roads where no 20 mph zones were implemented, was set up in order to take into account any background changes which may have effected the number of road collisions over time. These background changes include changes in technology, changes in drivers' behaviour and attitude, as well as the impact of road safety initiatives. By using a control group the researchers were confident that the reduction in casualties associated with 20 mph zones were because of the zones themselves rather than other factors. The study showed that there had been a

reduction in the number of casualties on all roads in London by 2% every year over the 20 year study period.

The study was not able to look at what the mean speeds were on the roads in London and whether drivers complied with them. Generally in London speeds on major roads tend, however, to be relatively low with an average speed of about 16 mph. However, when turning off of major roads onto residential streets it is actually possible to increase speed up to 30 or 40 mph as there tends to be less traffic on residential roads and the roads are straighter and wider. This is why in London 20 mph zones on residential roads can be very effective at reducing speeds from 40 to 17 mph. The difference between 20 mph zones and 20 mph speed limits is that the zones physically force drivers to travel at about 20 mph. There has been no work which has been done to look at the effectiveness of 20 mph speed limits in comparison to 20 mph zones. Originally research appeared to suggest that 20 mph zones forced drivers to travel at average speeds of 17 mph, however, there is increasing evidence to suggest that drivers are to speed up and slow down between traffic calming measures and the less likely they are to comply with the speed limit.

- 13.2i Members of the panel noted that over the course of 20 years approaches to traffic calming measures have changed and that rather than implementing speed bumps rumble strips and gateways and other measures are used to make roads look and feel different and so encourage more cautious and slower driving. Members of the panel asked if there had been any research conducted to compare different engineering measures to see which ones are more effective than others.
- 13.2j The panel heard that this was an area which the study had hoped to cover, however, detailed data on the 20 mph zones and the measures used in them was not available. There is a definite shift now in the use of traffic calming measures away from speed bumps and more use of a wider variety of engineering measures as well as other forms of technology such as the use of average speed cameras on very long stretches of roads and the use of speed limiters in cars.

There is a concern that the difference between 20 mph speed limits and 20 mph zones is not properly understood. The evidence appears to suggest that 20 mph speed limits can only reduce speeds by 1 – 2 mph and the evidence emerging from Portsmouth suggests that very few roads where traffic had moved at speeds of more than 24 mph prior to the introduction of a blanket speed limit saw more than a 1 – 2 mph reduction in speed afterwards. A sign tends to only have a limited impact on some drivers and may only influence driving behaviour for a week or so.

By using engineering measures and introducing 20 mph speed limits in places where people understand that there is a clear reason for driving

slower, you will achieve maximum compliance. Research suggests that most people will support the idea that residential roads should have 20 mph speed limits on them; however, the culture at the moment is to drive at 30 mph. People need to understand why there is a reason to drive slower than 30 mph in some areas. 20 mph speed limits need to be promoted along with the reasons for a 20 mph speed limit.

Resources need to be put aside to 'enforce' the 20 mph speed limit, for example by warning people of why they must not drive faster than 20 mph, rather than automatically fining those caught speeding. Speed cameras are not viewed by people as being a road safety initiative but are seen as a tax. It is only by advising drivers that there are valid reasons for driving at 20 mph that people will come to understand that 20 mph is a good thing and so create a culture of slower driving.

In terms of buses, in London, very few buses travel on routes where there are 20 mph zones as the zones are mostly used in residential areas. There is some suggestion from bus passengers that it is uncomfortable to be travelling on a bus which has to navigate over speed bumps. However, as generally 20 mph zones have not been introduced on major roads bus services have not been affected in London. It is the study's recommendations that 20 mph zones should only be used in residential areas not major roads.

- 13.2k Members of the panel noted that in some areas of the country 20 mph zones with physical measures have been introduced and then 20 mph speed limits added to them to expand the area covered by the lower speed limit. Members of the panel also noted that there are unlikely to be instant results on 20 mph speed limits but they will contribute to creating a culture of slower driving. Members of the panel asked whether the study supported the idea of introducing large areas of 20 mph speed limits without physical enforcement, and whether the study concluded that 20 mph speed limits should be introduced on all residential roads.
- 13.2l Based on the results of the study the LSHTM recommends that where there is a history of high numbers of road injuries then 20 mph zones should be introduced to reduce casualties from road collisions. The LSHTM recommends that all residential roads should be 20 mph and in those areas where speeds are already low this may require signs only whilst other areas may require the use of 20 mph zones. 20mph speed limits should be viewed as a long term solution that will require time for people to get used to. Over time changes in culture will occur and lower speeds will become more accepted by drivers.
- 13.2m The panel thanked Chris Grundy for his time and contributions.

13.3a **Evidence from Jack Hazelgrove, Chair of the Older People's Council**

There are key areas of the city, particularly at junctions, where road collisions occur and where the risk of a collision is very high. All road users are very impatient, particularly in the mornings, and this causes hazards. Young people travelling to school by scooter are often in a hurry and pose particular hazards to older people. For an older person there are many hazards in leaving their home and the streets offer many dangers. The introduction of a widespread 20 mph speed limit in residential areas of the city would probably be supported by, and offer benefits too, older people.

More effort needs to be made to improving the layouts of roads. Around Preston Circus it is particularly hazardous with many pedestrians crossing against a red light, or crossing half way across a busy road with no safe space to stand in. People do not always see the streams of traffic and the directions that they are flowing in. This was also the case near Old Steine where pedestrians would not pay attention to the way the traffic was moving. The council needs to do a better job of persuading people to be more patient and not hurry and to use the roads more safely.

The Older People's Council does not have a formal position on 20 mph speed limits or zones; however, it is interested in road safety in general. A-boards on the pavements pose a particular hazard for older people. Access to buses is also important and it is important to keep bus routes moving. More recently older people have had to navigate the dangers of icy pavements. These issues are all part of the same equation and the need to create a safer outside environment for everybody.

Older people do face particular hazards when moving around the city. For example, older people have more brittle bones which means that what may result in a trivial accident for a younger person can result in severe fractures and longer recovery times for an older person. Older people tend to have slightly slower reaction times than younger people and take more time crossing roads. Problems often emerge when an older person does not perceive themselves to have slowed down and think that they have enough time to cross a road when in fact they do not. Having 20 mph speed limits on roads where there are older people would be a great advantage. A free bus pass is also very important for older people as well as having the ability to move around safely in the city either by bus, car, or by cycle or foot. There is the danger that without the ability to move around, and move around safely, that an older person can become house bound and isolated.

13.3b The panel thanked Jack for his time and contributions.

13.3c Members of the panel noted that the council had done a great deal to enable older people to gain better access to buses such as dropping or raising kerbs and introducing leaning buses. Members of the panel were interested to know if there were other measures or initiatives that

older people take issue with that may in fact impede them when trying to cross roads.

- 13.3d The panel heard that A-boards are a real issue for older people being able to move around the city. Obstructions on a pavement increase the temptation for pedestrians to step out on to the road which contributes to road collisions occurring.
- 13.3e The panel noted that obstructions were a problem for older people. Members of the panel asked how older people coped with extended lengths of railings, and whether it increases their journey times significantly.
- 13.3f The panel heard that older people probably see the safety benefits of railings and that they are unlikely to be a significant impediment. May be if an older person was a very, very slow walker then it could cause a problem. However, on balance older people probably feel like the railings are a good thing.
- 13.3g Members of the panel asked whether reducing the speed limit would have positive benefits for older people. For example, if there are many traffic problems in the Preston Circus area with pedestrians crossing against the red man and with two streams of constant traffic, an area like this could be made safer if traffic were to travel at 20 mph.
- 13.3h The panel heard that it would make a difference in so far as if someone was hit then they would be likely to be less seriously injured or killed. However, a trivial accident to a younger person can result in a fatal accident for an older person. It is important to encourage a culture of patience where by pedestrians should wait before crossing the road.
- 13.3i The panel commented that the points made were very important and key to widening the thinking of the panel with regards to not only 20 mph speed limits/zones but other road engineering initiatives such as the timing of the green man to allow those extra few seconds for older people to safely reach the other side of the road. The effect of road use on the whole community of Brighton and Hove is very important for the panel to consider.
- 13.3j Members of the panel commented that older people greatly benefit from public transport, and surely would benefit from being able to reach a bus stop or train station safely. One of the benefits of 20 mph would be to make the environment more attractive to older people and more inviting for them to actually step out of their houses and go to the bus stop.
- 13.3k The panel heard that this then depends how far the nearest bus stop is. The total experience of using a bus service such as Kassel kerbs, leaning buses, talking signs have all helped to improve the experience

however the biggest improvement for older people would be an increase in the number of bus shelters.

13.3l Members of the panel asked if speed reductions would have a direct benefit for older people.

13.3m The panel heard that as Chair of the Older People's Council Jack was firmly of the view that the introduction of a 20 mph limit would be of benefit to older people in Brighton and Hove.

13.3n The panel thanked Jack Hazelgrove for his time and contributions.

13.4a **Evidence from Tony Green, representative from Bricycles**

Bricycles greatly supports a reduction in speed limits to 20 mph, and have formally written to the scrutiny panel to inform the panel of their views.

It is commonly known that the speed at which traffic travels and the severity of injury is directly related. A recent Transport of Laboratory report on road collisions between vehicles and cyclists reported that for cyclists the casualty severity increased with the posted speed limit. The study in London conducted by the LSHTM showed that 20 mph zones reduce fatal and serious cyclist casualties by 38%. Experience from Hilden in Germany and Graz in Austria has shown that 20 mph speed limits have clear road safety benefits for non-motorised road users and children. Portsmouth city has recently adopted a citywide 20 mph speed limit. Initial results from this scheme are very positive with road casualties falling by 15% and the total number of accidents falling by 13%. Those aged under 15 and over 70, saw significant positive benefits and reductions in casualties. More data on the scheme in Portsmouth needs to be collected but similar results have been replicated elsewhere such as in Hull.

A speed reduction to 20 mph makes sense for all road users. The Department for Transport (DfT) recently circulated guidance on 20 mph zones which means that they no longer require repeater signs or expensive traffic calming measures. The DfT is encouraging all local authorities to adopt 20 mph speed limits for the benefits which it brings for quality of life and more sustainable modes of transport. Many cities across the country are adopting 20 mph speed limits and Brighton and Hove need to use this opportunity to be at the forefront of the change.

Lastly, it should be noted that the information contained in STATS19 only included those collisions which take place on roads; it does not include collisions which take place off road on cycle tracks and lanes such as the one along the seafront. There is a problem of under reporting in STATS19. Also, North Street is operating under a 20 mph speed limit and Brighton & Hove buses maintain an unofficial speed

limit of 15 mph in this area so they are able to reduce their speed and still maintain an effective bus service.

- 13.4b The panel thanked Tony for his evidence.
- 13.4c Members of the panel asked if Bricycles were aware whether buses and cyclists are brought into increased conflict with the introduction of 20 mph speed limits. Members of the panel also asked whether Bricycles was aware if there were a significant number of accidents caused by cyclists jumping lights or using the pavement.
- 13.4d The panel heard that most cyclists are responsible and not likely to break the law, jumping red lights is a problem, but it is not the main cause of accidents. There appears to be no firm evidence as to whether 20 mph speed limits bring cyclists and buses either more or less into conflict. Buses always have to stop every couple of yards so the faster cyclists are already in conflict with buses. It is Bricycles opinion that 20 mph speed limits have the potential of reducing rather than increasing conflict between buses and cyclists.
- 13.4e Members of the panel asked whether the majority of accidents involving cyclists are caused by speed alone, or if the majority of accidents involving cyclists are caused by road users making poorly judged manoeuvres.
- 13.4f The panel heard that in urban areas like Brighton and Hove speed isn't the main cause of accidents involving cyclists as the majority of accidents occur at junctions so speed is not a factor. However, speed is a big disincentive to encouraging more people to cycle.
- 13.4g Members of the panel asked if Bricycles would be an advocate for speed limits for cyclists, particularly on cycle lanes such as the seafront where cyclists are able to travel at speed.
- 13.4h The panel heard that there currently are recommended speed limits for various cycle tracks and lanes in the city such as the cycle track along the seafront. However, the actual speed which a cyclist will travel is subject to certain factors; clearly cyclists have to travel much slower at weekends. There is a big difference between speed limits for motorists and cyclists, for example motorists will tend to travel at the suggested speed limit, such as 30 mph, where as cyclists tend to travel at different speeds on the same roads depending on the cyclist.
- 13.4i Members of the panel asked what model of speed reduction cyclists in this city would benefit from; would cyclists like to see a blanket speed reduction to 20 mph with traffic calming measures installed afterwards in the hot spot areas when resources become available.
- 13.4j The panel heard that Bricycles would like to see a citywide speed reduction however they do realise that this may not be possible straight

away. A good place to start would be to make the city centre 20 mph. There is less need for traffic calming measures if areas of 20 mph speed limits are implemented and road users are encouraged and enforced to comply with the new limit. Whilst it is useful to use residential roads as a marker for introducing 20 mph speed limits, people reside on many different streets and roads are used for a variety of activities. People just need time to get used to the concept of 20 mph speed limits.

- 13.4k Members of the panel noted that the seafront cycle lane often causes cyclists to come into conflict with visitors who are less aware of the 'rules' of pedestrian and cyclist use on the seafront pavement. Surely, part of the solution to increasing safety for cyclists is to lower speeds so that cyclists are more likely to use the road and not the pavement and come into conflict with pedestrians.
- 13.4l The panel heard that 20 mph speed limits could produce a step change improvement in the conditions for cycling, indeed introducing a 20 mph speed limit could do far more for cyclists and potential cyclists in the city than introducing other facilities for cyclists.
- 13.4m The panel thanked Tony Green for his time and contributions.
- 13.5a **Members of the panel and the witnesses present held a general discussion around the issues raised by the evidence given.**
- 13.5b Members of the panel asked how the council could go about achieving a change in driving culture and encourage slower driving.
- 13.5c The panel heard that changing culture is not going to happen overnight. Some drivers will get on board sooner than others, whilst others will need more encouragement and others will take longer to see that lower speeds are better for everyone.
- 13.5d Members of the panel commented that it was likely that a communications campaign of some sort will need to be undertaken to support any changes, and were interested to know whether there were any ideas of other road safety initiatives which had been undertaken successfully in other councils.
- 13.5e The panel heard that conducting surveys of problem areas is a key place to start as it is only through collecting information that perceptions of the problems can be changed.
- 13.5f Members of the panel commented that behaviour change was difficult to bring about. Some of the national road safety campaigns have been very good and are designed to shock, and if these messages can be brought down to a local level using local roads and junctions then it would have more of an impact on all road users in Brighton and Hove.

- 13.5g Members of the panel noted that a lot of motorists are also cyclists and all motorists are pedestrians at some point in their day. There are a substantial number of pedestrians that ignore pedestrian crossings and cross in the middle of busy roads where there are no safe spaces for pedestrians to cross. Some of the local action teams have road safety as a theme, but may be more local action teams should be encouraged to work on this theme and spread road safety messages amongst local communities. All road users need to alter their attitudes to using the road and help to create a safer environment for everybody.
- 13.5h The panel heard that it is important that some money is used for 'friendly enforcement', not just penalised enforcement. People do appear to respond positively to 20 mph speed limits when they know the reasons for putting 20 mph speed limits in, and educating people as to the reasons for introducing 20 mph speed limits appears to be important. It is also important to work with young people and educate them about safe road use. However, most evidence suggests that traditional road safety education does not work. There are huge differences between different ethnic groups and socio economic groups in those affected by road injuries. In London there is a lot of work being done to reach out to different ethnic groups to educate them in different ways, such as through theatre and talking to them to find out how they use the roads.
- 13.5i Members of the panel asked why economically disadvantaged groups and ethnic minorities were more likely to be involved in road collisions and whether it was because they were more likely to be pedestrians.
- 13.5j The panel heard that there are three possible suggestions as to why these groups are more likely to be involved in road collisions. Firstly, evidence from the police suggests that a person's attitude to the law determines their likelihood of being involved in a road collision. In 80 - 90 % of fatal collisions, the driver will be known to the police. Secondly these groups of people may have different patterns in road use to other groups. Thirdly they may have different attitudes to road safety such as different perceptions as to what the safe places to walk may be, different attitudes to driving, and some groups may be more reckless than others.
- 13.5k Members of the panel noted that introducing 20 mph speed limits into only the city centre would not resolve the problems of speeding vehicles in the wider city area such as Woodingdean, Bevendean and Coldean, where there are a number of roads that lend themselves to high speeds and dangerous driving.
- 13.5l The panel heard that there is a problem with speed in many places, but that it is not a reason to not introduce at least some initial initiative. There are those that will comply with the new speed limit straight away and then gradually others will get on board until it is seen as being

accepted practice. Reductions have to start some where, and the city centre would be a good place to start.

13.5m The panel heard that the costs of various speed reduction initiatives is a problem. The study conducted in London suggested that 20 mph zones cost about £70,000 per one kilometre. The main advantage of 20 mph speed limits is that it is a cheaper option than 20 mph zones. There are new technologies coming in that may be helpful to increasing road safety and reducing speed. For example traffic lights which are linked to the speed of traffic so that if traffic is travelling too fast the lights stay red for longer. If traffic is travelling according to the speed limit then the lights stay green for longer. Such a system has been used extensively on continental Europe and has been very successful with drivers learning very quickly that driving at a constant slower speed is better. Such a system has never been trialled in the UK.

Achieving slower speeds will require a cultural shift and the techniques such as the one described above have been used in Europe for a lot longer. Area wide 20 mph speed limits in all towns and cities across the UK, whether it is on all roads or on all residential roads, are just a matter of time as the evidence is clear that 20 mph saves lives. The problem local authorities are faced with at the moment is what to do for now. Do you for ease and cheapness introduce 20 mph speed limits everywhere, or just introduce it on roads where it will have a impact or where there is a definite casualty driven need for it. By introducing 20 mph speed limits on residential roads but keeping main roads free moving at 30 mph, a cultural shift will probably be achieved faster and sooner as people will understand the reasons for it.

13.5n The panel heard that a citywide speed limit would probably encourage a lot more people to cycle on the roads and if traffic is moving slower then there may not be the need for dedicated cycle lanes in which case the money which would have been used for cycle lanes could be used to implement a 20 mph scheme. Slower speeds of traffic would really help cyclists particularly on roads where cycle lanes can't go.

13.5o The panel heard that in areas of London cyclists are struggling to use the dedicated cycle lanes as they tend to stop abruptly or have parked cars in the way. The money for 20 mph schemes will come from more joined up thinking on transport initiatives.

13.5p Members of the panel commented that whilst it would be an ideal situation whereby more and more cyclists feel confident enough and safe enough to share the road with vehicles, it will take some time to get there and until then having separate road space dedicated for cyclists is what cyclists appeared to want. It is difficult to put cycle lanes in all the places that cyclists desire as the city was not originally built with cycle and car use in mind.

13.5q The panel heard that 20 mph saves lives and most people do not want cars shooting past their houses and speeding down their residential roads. Most people are now recognising that a variety of roads function as someone's residential road. Introducing 20 mph speed limits/zones on residential roads and leaving major transport routes at 30 mph makes sense to many people and they will support it. There is a problem with policing and enforcing 20 mph, but creative solutions need to be found; such as using other people apart from the police to undertake friendly enforcement, or using innovative technology like traffic sensors or average speed cameras.

13.5r The discussions were drawn to a conclusion and the witnesses thanked for their time and contributions.

14 Dates of future meetings of the panel were confirmed as:

14.1 23 February 2010, at 10 am, Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall

15 Any other business

15.1 None.

The meeting concluded at 12.00

APPENDIX 3D: MINUTES OF PANEL'S PUBLIC MEETING: 23/02/2010

**Brighton and Hove City Council
Environment and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Ad Hoc Panel – 20 mph speed limits/zones**

**10.00 am 23 February 2010
Minutes**

Present: Councillors West (Chairman), Wells, Watkins, Mitchell, Bennett
Also present: Councillor Geoffrey Theobald, Councillor Ian Davey, Christina Summers, Mike Birri, Councillor David Smart, Councillor Melanie Davis, Councillor Denise Cobb, Larry Halley, Mag Morris, Heike Feldpausch, Phil Clarke, Libby Young

Part One

16 Procedural business

16a Declaration of substitutes

16.1 Substitutes are not allowed on Scrutiny Panels.

16b Declaration of interest

16.2 (Please refer to the minutes of the panel's meeting on 19 January 2010.) Councillor Geoff Wells advised the panel that one of the speakers today was from the Woodingdean Speedwatch group; a group who he is also a member of. Councillor David Watkins advised the panel that the Lansdowne Area Resident's Association is a group from within his ward, although he is not a member of the group. Councillor Pete West also advised the panel that he had been working with a group in Ditchling Rise on road traffic issues and had presented a petition from the group at a Cabinet Member Meeting.

16c Declaration of party whip

16.3 There were none.

16d Exclusion of press and public

16.4 In accordance with section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, it was considered whether the press and public should be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of any items contained in the agenda, having regard to the nature of the business to be transacted and the nature of the proceedings and the likelihood as to whether, if the members of the press and public were present, there would be disclosure to them of confidential or exempt information as defined in section 100I of the said Act.

16.5 **Resolved** – That the press and public are not excluded from the meeting.

17 Chairman's communications

17.1 All of those present were welcomed and introductions took place. The chairman thanked everyone for their involvement, particularly the witnesses for taking the time to attend the public meeting and for being involved in the evidence gathering process.

17.2 For the benefit of all attendees the purpose of the scrutiny review was reiterated as: to investigate the effects of reducing the speed limit in some residential and built-up areas of the city to 20 mph. Speed reduction initiatives could include either redesigning roads within the city to include traffic calming measures, or simply reducing the default speed limit on roads to 20 mph through the use of signs only.

17.3 The format of the meeting was outlined as follows: after Councillor Geoffrey Theobald and Councillor Ian Davey have each spoken, each representative from the residents associations will be invited up to the microphone one at a time to speak to the panel for 5 minutes followed by up to 5 minutes of questions from the panel.

17.4 The panel agreed to proceed as outlined by the chairman.

18 Evidence from the witnesses

18.1 The panel heard evidence from a number of witnesses.

18.2a Evidence from Environment Cabinet Member, Councillor Geoffrey Theobald

Members of the panel were thanked for taking the time to look into the issue of 20 mph speed limits and 20 mph zones. It was acknowledged that this was an extremely complex issue, which was why it had been referred to scrutiny in order to enable an in-depth study to be undertaken. A number of requests to date for various 20 mph schemes have been made to the Environment Cabinet Member, and a number of these have been approved. The advantages of 20 mph are apparent; however, the introduction of any 20 mph scheme should not have an adverse effect on the flow of traffic in the city, nor should it have an adverse economic impact on the city.

There are a number of different types of roads in Brighton & Hove. Along roads such as Dyke road, London Road, Kings Road and the A259 from Peacehaven for example, if traffic was to travel at 20 mph then there would be a lot of congestion which could contribute to the city becoming grid locked. Any 20 mph scheme would need to take this into account. The Bus Company has already advised the panel that slower buses would not help the movement of traffic in the city. There

are a number of issues which need to be considered when introducing any 20 mph scheme; road safety, air quality, pollution, traffic displacement and traffic flow. All of these areas need to be studied and considered by the panel. A one size fits all blanket approach to a 20 mph scheme is unlikely to be a solution for the city.

There exist already in the city a number of 20 mph schemes in the vicinity of schools and busy shopping areas. In Patcham Ward residents have campaigned for a 20 mph stretch on one road by a primary school and it has been implemented with the support of the Environment Cabinet Member and Sussex police. Any 20 mph scheme introduced needs to be made, as much as possible, self enforcing with engineering measures included when necessary. 20 mph schemes indicated by signs only are not necessarily easy to enforce so not everyone will comply with them, which is why a 20 mph scheme needs to be self enforcing in order to ensure that the scheme has the maximum impact that it can. This is a view which is also held by the Department for Transport and by the Association of Chief Police Officers that 20 mph schemes should be self enforcing.

The effect of traffic displacement is an important one to be considered. There is evidence to suggest that in some areas where 20 mph zones have been introduced, such as in Hartington Road, average traffic flow is reduced in the area. For example in Hartington Road traffic flows reduced by 13% after the installation of a 20 mph zone. Based on evidence from other local authorities, 20 mph zones tend to be more effective than 20 mph speed limits. However, the engineering works that are needed for 20 mph zones are obviously more expensive. These are all things which the panel will need to weigh up and consider, particularly in a time of restricted finances.

The Cabinet Member for Environment indicated that he would certainly support 20 mph zones in busy shopping streets and outside schools. The difficulty of 20 mph becomes more apparent when other areas are contemplated; however, the panel's consideration of this issue will be most welcome.

- 18.2b The panel thanked Geoffrey Theobald for his time and contributions.
- 18.2c Members of the panel noted that they have had evidence that a blanket 20 mph scheme across the city would be the best way to implement a speed reduction scheme as when a driver enters a 20 mph area there is less confusion, if the signage is good enough, and less entering and exiting into and out of different speed limits. The panel has also heard evidence that suggests that the average speed across the city is only about 17 mph anyway.
- 18.2d The panel heard that a blanket 20 mph speed limit indicated on the boundary of the city may be easier to understand. However, average speeds across the cities boundaries are unlikely to be 17 mph, and are

much more varied than this. For example traffic on the A23, London Road, Lewes Road, Warren Road, around the universities etc is probably not travelling as low as 20 mph. Indeed in some areas of the city drivers would have to apply the brakes all the time whilst driving in order to keep under 20 mph. It is also not productive to implement a scheme which will not be complied with.

- 18.2e Members of the panel noted that the council had received a lot of requests for traffic calming and 20 mph zones and the zones have been to date incrementally introduced, and calls for further measures have been increasing. Members of the panel asked in terms of policy what has been driving the consideration and implementation of 20 mph zones; was it road safety and accident reduction? Members of the panel also asked when the local authority looks at a junction when there have been calls to make it safer, eg by introducing traffic signals, and residents in the area fear that negative traffic displacement will occur in the area, is a 20 mph zone considered as part of the works to make the area safer.
- 18.2f The panel heard that decisions are based on the advice of professional officers, consideration of the accident figures, and the possibility of an accident occurring in the area. As far as traffic signals are concerned traffic displacement is probably considered as secondary to the accident figures. Some sort of criteria is required when deciding on whether to implement a scheme or not, and the leading criteria which has been used is that of the number of accidents in an area, and the possibility of accidents occurring in an area.
- 18.2g Members of the panel asked if after the introduction of a 20 mph zone have resident surveys been conducted to monitor the impact of the zone and how residents feel about the scheme.
- 18.2h The panel heard from the Road Safety Manager that the evaluation was more quantitative and based around traffic flow and speed variation using before and after data and that he was not aware of any public satisfaction data.
- 18.2i The panel thanked Geoffrey Theobald for his time and contributions.
- 18.3a **Evidence from Councillor Ian Davey, proposer of Council Notice of Motion on 20 mph**

Councillor Ian Davey also echoed his appreciation of the time and effort which the panel were putting into the scrutiny review. It was noted that, in recent years, Brighton and Hove City Council has led the way in introducing many sustainable transport projects; for example, New Road, a bus partnership, provisions for cyclists, talking bus stops, and urban realm improvements to the seafront and North Road. What has been achieved so far has been a great start.

There have been a number of 20 mph zones introduced into the city, and these have proved very popular with residents who live in the zones. There are, however, difficulties with the current mode of implementing 20 mph zones as all too often they rely on the use of speed bumps and humps, which are unpopular with buses, cyclists and the emergency services. Residents living by the speed bumps also find them to be noisy and they are expensive to implement and to maintain. There are problems with the incremental approach to introducing 20 mph zones which the council has favoured to date. For example, whilst 20 mph zones outside schools are an excellent safety measure for those travelling directly outside schools, it does nothing to improve the safety of those journeying greater distances to go to school.

There have been no big new safety schemes introduced recently into the city. Residents requesting 20 mph zones in their areas are being told that if there aren't accidents in their area, then 20 mph zones will not be introduced. This means that residents think that they have to wait for someone to be killed before they get to have a zone in their area; and this is clearly too little too late. There needs to be another way forward to tackling high speeds on our cities roads, particularly with the current budget pressures which the council is facing.

Portsmouth City Council has introduced 20 mph speed limits onto the majority of its road network at the cost of about £500,000. No speed humps or bumps were introduced. The 20 mph speed limit was a signs only scheme, and was introduced almost two years ago. As a result of this scheme there has been a reduction in mean speeds of up to 7 mph on some of the roads where traffic was previously moving at its fastest. There was a 13% reduction in the number of accidents and a 15% reduction in the number of casualties with older people and younger people benefiting greatly. Additionally, not only did pedestrians and cyclists experience fewer accidents but car occupants did too. Clearly it is still early days and the data on the impact of the Portsmouth scheme is still emerging, however, what has happened in Portsmouth is clearly important to consider.

In order for any 20 mph scheme to be a success it will require community buy-in. A 20 mph scheme should be driven by community demand, and its implementation should involve community and stakeholder engagement. Any area chosen to be part of a 20 mph scheme should be large, coherent and consistent, and in an area where the average speeds are not that high. Enforcement is also important and any scheme implemented should have police support through educational activities and encouragement by police to comply with the limit. Most importantly any scheme introduced should be backed up with community engagement activities, and this should be maintained throughout.

There are many local authorities across the country that are pursuing 20 mph schemes, and the Department for Transport has revisited its guidance recently on this issue.

A 20 mph scheme in Brighton and Hove could be introduced in two phases. Firstly, a 20 mph scheme could be introduced into a residential area where there is a high volume of retail and pedestrian activity and already low average speeds. An area such as the city centre would be an ideal starting place, with all roads in the area reduced to 20 mph as average speeds are already quite low. The second phase would then involve looking at other residential areas within the local authorities boundaries to identify areas which could form part of a 20 mph area whilst leaving arterial roads at 30 mph.

18.3b The panel thanked Ian Davey for his time and contributions.

18.3c Members of the panel noted that they will be undertaking a site visit to Portsmouth to see for themselves the scheme which had been introduced there.

18.3d The panel thanked Ian Davey for his time and contributions.

18.4a Evidence from Christina Summers, representative from the London Road Area Local Action Team

The London Road Area Local Action Team has 90 members on its regular email list of which approximately half are residents and businesses with the rest being local services and agencies. The area that the LAT covers is very diverse so traffic speeds present different problems from rat running through residential areas to straight forward speeding along arterial roads.

In the Viaduct Rise area (the area between Viaduct Road and Ditchling Rise) there is already a 20 mph zone with signage and speed bumps. There have been no complaints about the zone but the area is constantly used as a rat run between Beaconsfield Road and Ditchling Road in both directions. There are two main problems with the zone. Firstly, the signage is not clear; the signs are too small and not obvious. Secondly, big lorries cut through from Ditchling Road into Ditchling Rise in the early hours of the morning heading for the waste depot in Hollingdean and it is this which causes residents the most amount of distress, in fact, it probably overshadows other problems in the area, including the breaking of the current 20 mph speed limit. As well as clearer 20 mph speed limit signs the area would benefit from being closed to commercial vehicles, especially lorries.

There have been complaints made to the LAT from Kingsbury Road residents about rat running between Baker Street and London Road. Two elderly residents in the area are particularly concerned about their safety as cars travel so quickly along the road and have even been

known to mount the pavement outside their house. Introducing 20 mph speed restrictions in these areas would be a great start. A 20 mph speed limit in all of these mixed residential and retail business roads would be a good start.

A complaint has been received by the LAT that traffic in New England Road, Preston Circus and Viaduct Road constantly break the current speed limit of 30 mph and that enforcement of the 30 mph speed limit is a problem. A question was put to the Cabinet Member for Environment at Full Council in December 2009 asking for quick inexpensive measures to be taken such as the introduction of a speed camera. However the response, which appears to be the same for any enquiry of this kind, was that this can not be done without the accident and injury statistics to prove the need for an intervention. The problem with such an approach as this is that it will be too late for some people and it leads to the perception that the general well-being of pedestrians and cyclists is not considered important. If the whole junction, and the roads leading into it, were made a 20 mph zone with large, clear signage then this visible change could possibly make drivers think about the speed they are travelling.

York Place, like Preston Circus is designed for car drivers, not for pedestrians or cyclists despite the large numbers who use these particular roads to access amenities such as shops and a church. Traffic appears to break the 30 mph speed limit and a Pedestrian Crossing doesn't appear to slow the traffic down nor make people feel safer. A number of accidents have, it is understood, taken place here with pedestrians. Traders along York Place constantly refer to this problem at LAT meetings. A reduction of the speed limit to 20 mph with very clear signage and a zebra crossing would be welcomed by those in the London Road LAT area.

The key is not in making piecemeal changes in response to complaints, or worse, accidents, but to have a total shift in thinking so that, rather than caging pedestrians off the roads by means of railings and other such deterrents in the name of safety from vehicles, main traffic routes should be part of larger open spaces giving pedestrians and cyclists equal travelling rights to car drivers. The car has priority on motorways and perhaps major routes approaching the city but this should not be the case within the city itself.

The London Road LAT area would benefit from clearer, larger 20 mph zone signage, being a no access area to large commercial vehicles in these zones, proper enforcement of speed limits on main/arterial routes, and in the longer-term, changes to the layout and road surfaces. Speaking from a personal perspective, there needs to be more consistency across the city to avoid confusion and the excuses made by car drivers that there are too many variations in the speed limit. A 20 mph speed limit across the city should be introduced. If there is one thing which the council could do improve road safety in the

city, it would be to adopt a risk assessment led approach to notoriously bad areas, rather than an accident led approach to introducing road safety initiatives.

- 18.4b The panel thanked Christina Summers for her time and contributions.
- 18.4c Members of the panel asked whether members of the London Road Area Local Action Team had a particular traffic calming measure which they preferred.
- 18.4d The panel heard that it depends as the area covered by the action team is fragmented with some areas experiencing specific traffic problems of their own. To prevent rat running it is felt that signage is important, and something needs to be done to prevent large vehicles travelling through the area. Whilst an agreement has reduced the numbers of large operatives using the roads a number of smaller operatives still cut through. The London Road Area is a confusing configuration as shops and residents reside side by side.
- 18.4e Members of the panel noted the concerns raised and that clearly speeding is not the only problem experienced on the roads and that heavy traffic moving through residential areas can also cause problems. 20 mph may not offer a complete solution to all the problems of road safety.
- 18.4f Members of the panel noted that it was important to consider the extra benefits that may arise from 20 mph.
- 18.4g The panel thanked Christina Summers for her time and contributions.
- 18.5a **Evidence from Mike Birri, representative from Lansdowne Area Residents' Association**

The Lansdowne Area Residents' Association represents residents living in Lansdowne Place and its neighbouring areas. Over the years the association has made many representations to the council and have managed to substantially improve the environment of the area. Improvements have involved flower baskets, lamp posts, cycle racks, trees and other aspects. However, over the years, access to the main arterial routes in the area have been greatly effected by the closure to traffic of through passage in Brunswick Square as well as the narrowing of exits and entrances to various roads. The opening of a Tesco store in the area has led to bottlenecks in traffic flows and the soon to be opened Sainsbury store will cause more traffic jams and an increase in delivery vans. There has been a substantial increase in the volume of traffic in the Lansdowne area.

Lansdowne Road is a very narrow street and driving at 30 mph can be a serious hazard; it has also become a rat run. If the speed limit were to be reduced to 20 mph then it would deter drivers from driving along

the road and so improve the safety of school pupils using the roads in that area. Lansdowne Place is also a very busy road as it provides cycle access to other roads, lots of children are in the near vicinity and delivery lorries use it to access the city from the seafront. This road is also an invitation to speed as the road is very wide and as traffic leave the traffic problems of the seafront and Western Road they tend to put their foot down. A traffic island has been installed to improve safety but it has had no impact.

The buildings in the Lansdowne area are all Grade 2 listed and the vehicles have an impact on their structures. Tescos have agreed to reduce the size and speed of their delivery lorries and this has helped. However, if all traffic were to reduce their speed it would greatly improve the local environment, reduce pollution, and increase the quality of life of residents living in the area.

18.5b The panel thanked Mike Birri for his time and contributions

18.5c Members of the panel noted that these are problems which are replicated right across the city. The movement of large vehicles along roads, which with the state of the roads as they are, causes excessive vibration; 20 mph speed restrictions would perhaps ease this.

18.5d Members of the panel asked for clarification as to whether the problems in the Lansdowne area were the result of the increase in traffic in the area, or the speed of traffic in the area.

18.5e The panel heard that it was probably both. Since the closing off of Brunswick Square and the narrowing of several other roads, traffic has become funnelled through the area. On top of this, however, lorries travel through the area at quite a speed which makes the buildings shake and the traffic is a real danger to children trying to cross the road.

18.5f The panel thanked Mike Birri for his time and contributions.

18.6a **Evidence from Councillor David Smart, representing Hangleton and Knoll**

The Hangleton and Knoll ward contains within it what was once the main east west route of the A27 where traffic is subject to a 40 mph speed limit. The ward also contains the old by-pass road where traffic is subject to a 30 mph speed limit. There have been numerous petitions to the council from residents in this ward over the last 7 years concerning traffic problems in this area. In general there is a view within the ward that there is a problem with the speed of traffic. The Old Shoreham Road, Hangleton Road and Hangleton Way have particular problems with speeding traffic.

The ward does not have any 20 mph areas currently but there are zones with traffic calming on the Knoll Estate, and these are particularly hated by car drivers although perhaps not by all residents. There used to be two routes to get into the north of the ward, but a no right turn was placed at the top of Olive Road and this resulted in all the traffic being pushed onto the other road and speed bumps were then introduced to calm the traffic.

An estimated 70% of residents in the Hangleton and Knoll ward would probably be in favour of a 20 mph speed limit with signs only. The rest would probably prefer a traffic calmed zone with signs and some means of forcing traffic down. Many residents in this area are against the use of speed bumps so would want other traffic calming measures to be used. In the main the ward would be in favour of a default speed limit of 20 mph on certain roads with some wanting this applied across the city although no one stated a preference for having 20 mph on main through roads in the city.

The most coherent method of introducing 20 mph speed limits would be through the use of signs. However there is a concern about levels of pollution which may rise as a result of a citywide 20 mph speed limit. Cars do not run at their most efficient at 20 mph, additionally, introducing lower speeds would not necessarily encourage more walking and cycling.

The national road safety advertising campaigns are very effective, such as the 'alive at 30 mph and dead at 40 mph'. The council could undertake a local campaign around the benefits of 20 mph and survival rates.

- 18.6b The panel thanked Councillor David Smart for his time and contributions
- 18.6c Members of the panel asked if they could have some clarity around the particular roads which residents in Hangleton and Knoll would perhaps support 20 mph speed limits on. Where these main roads or side roads?
- 18.6d The panel heard that it would most likely be on roads around hospitals and schools and some select priority areas. For example, Goldstone school is served by a single entry system and in areas such as council estates where it is mainly residents and a few delivery vehicles then these would be ideal 20 mph areas. Initially specific areas could be suggested, but then these could be added too to develop linked areas of 20 mph speed limits, although not one large citywide 20 mph area.
- 18.6e Members of the panel asked whether residents in the Stapley Road area were in favour of the measures taken to lower speeds in that area and whether they were in favour of just signs or signs with other measures.

- 18.6f The panel heard that signing alone in this area would probably be good enough. In all these areas the problem is not specifically speed but the use of goods vehicles travelling through the area. The roads themselves often act as good speed limiters. However, 20 mph speed limits need to be enforced by Sussex Police and if Sussex Police do not have the capacity to do this then any 20 mph scheme that is introduced is not likely to be effective.
- 18.6g Members of the panel said that it is interesting to hear what residents further out of the city centre may think of 20 mph initiatives in their area. Members of the panel asked whether Old Shoreham Road is a problem within this ward, and whether residents would support a speed reduction on all residential areas of the ward bar, or including, main roads, and whether residents would support a signs only approach to this.
- 18.6h The panel heard that it is difficult to say but that possibly a speed reduction on all residential areas in the ward would be largely supported. Old Shoreham Road is the main exit out of the city and Hangleton Road is used to by-pass the city centre, to put these roads to 20 mph would probably be considered an error, but 30 mph would be strongly supported on the Old Shoreham Road which is currently 40 mph in the Hangleton and Knoll ward. However, on residential roads and in council estates most residents would probably support areas of 20 mph with the use of signs but not bumps, if enforced by Sussex Police.
- 18.6i The panel thanked Councillor David Smart for his time and contributions.
- 18.7a **Evidence from Councillor Melanie Davis, representing the Goldsmid Ward**

Speeding traffic is probably the single issue which residents are most concerned about in this ward. Well over 20 petitions have been submitted to the council from Goldsmid ward on issues of speeding traffic. Residents living in this ward feel unsafe, there are constant near misses and there is a perception of a lack of safety in the area. There are concerns that the council is not listening to the resident's worries over this matter, and it is beginning to reflect badly on the council.

Goldsmid Ward is characterised by arterial roads, such as Old Shoreham Road, which traffic shoots along to avoid red traffic lights. On The Drive a number of schools are situated, and the pupils attending these face constant danger from the lack of safety in the area and from the vehicles shooting through traffic lights to avoid a red light. There are two east to west roads which cut through the ward, the Old Shoreham Road and parallel further south the Cromwell/Davigdor/Goldsmid Roads which are being used by drivers

as short cuts. Residents feel that to try to cross these roads they are taking their lives into their own hands. There are a number of care homes in this area and older people are in danger from speeding traffic. There are also problems of speeding traffic around the park and outside the many schools in the area. It is difficult to enforce single stretches of 20 mph speed limits when surrounding roads have higher speed limits.

Speaking personally, most people in the ward would probably feel that 20 mph speed limits offer a safer way to live. Whether this is achieved through signage, traffic calming or, what is probably more likely, a bit of both. There is a general consensus within the ward that the streets are being used as rat runs and cut-throughs and the safety of young children, families, and older people are not being taken into account. The arterial roads in the ward are just plain dangerous and would probably need to have 20 mph speed restrictions place on them as well.

- 18.7b The panel thanked Councillor Melanie Davis for her time and contributions.
- 18.7c Members of the panel asked whether 20 mph speed limits would be best on just the north to south roads in the area or on the east to west roads of the area as well. Would residents want to see a blanket 20 mph speed limit across the ward?
- 18.7d The panel heard that a piecemeal approach to reducing speed limits may not work. Whilst the arterial roads do have bus routes on them, they are also the roads which residents are most scared to cross. Additionally, if arterial roads are not included in a 20 mph scheme in the ward and reductions occurred on just the side roads then this would possibly be more confusing for drivers.
- 18.7e Members of the panel noted that a mixture of signage and traffic calming may be needed in the area. Members of the panel asked whether safety issues on the arterial roads in the ward would be improved if pedestrian crossing facilities were introduced in the area with pedestrian desire lines taken into account.
- 18.7f The panel heard that there were over 3,000 children going to school near junctions on the Old Shoreham road, yet despite the large numbers of school children in the area there are patches of road where there were no safe places for pedestrians to cross. What type of crossing was required is difficult to suggest, but something needs to be done to slow the traffic down and something other than just signs and bumps will be needed.
- 18.7g The panel noted the urgent need for pedestrian crossings in this area.

18.7h Members of the panel asked if, just to be clear, some residents in the Goldsmid ward would be keen for a blanket 20 mph speed limit in the ward.

18.7i The panel heard that any 20 mph scheme may not work in the ward unless the arterial roads in the area were also slowed down. Because of the grid like nature of the ward a 20 mph scheme may not have an impact unless all roads are included in a 20 mph scheme.

18.7j The panel thanked Councillor Melanie Davis for her time and contributions.

18.8a Evidence from Councillor Denise Cobb, representing Westbourne/Poets Corner

This evidence is based on email responses received by Councillor Denise Cobb to the questions circulated to the representatives a few days prior to today's meeting.

There is a perception amongst some residents in Westbourne that traffic does speed in some areas of the ward, but also there is a perception that generally traffic does not travel too fast for the conditions. Rat running is often associated with delays due to road works, to avoid traffic lights or when the volume of traffic is excessively high. Rat running has been reported from the Pembrokes, the Princes and the Poets Corner areas. There are 20 mph zones in the ward and these have not been very successful; the 20 mph limit is often ignored, particularly at night.

It would be a very nice improvement to have some pavements widened and the remaining roads finished with paving stones. That would probably slow the cars to even less than 20 mph. The benefit of such environmental improvements is that it does not criminalise drivers. If there are not the resources available to undertake environmental changes such as this one, to encourage a naturally lower speed of traffic then changes should not be implemented. To artificially lower the speed limit on roads where it is not appropriate to drive at a slow speed will criminalise drivers. Draconian traffic laws and excessive ugly signage are not going to benefit the city. If an area requires slow speeds then most drivers will adapt and drive slower to suit the conditions. Road safety should not be used as an excuse to penalise car drivers and victimise car users.

20 mph speed limits could be extended in some areas of the city, but to cover the whole city with a blanket 20 mph speed limit would be a major error. It can be more dangerous to drive at 20 mph in some situations and driving at this speed will increase the levels of carbon emissions in the city. Fines collected from parking and speed cameras should be used to tackle traffic problem areas. 20 mph zones could be introduced, for example, outside schools instead of installing cycle

racks that save no ones lives. Law abiding motorists should not be targeted and convictions should not be used as a form of collecting money. Most cars are designed to drive efficiently at 35 to 40 mph. It is difficult to drive at 30 mph in some areas, and drivers should not be further criminalised.

Introducing lower speeds will not increase walking and cycling in the city. There are numerous out door activities which residents can engage with should they choose to do so and they are more likely to walk along the seafront then stroll around the city's residential streets. Some cyclists will only cycle when the weather is fine, when they are not in a hurry and when they don't have big items to carry.

If the council is serious about introducing 20 mph speed limits then it should be done in a way that makes it a natural speed for vehicles to travel at, for example, the changes which have been implemented in New Road. However this would require substantial investment and it is more important to introduce other initiatives such as a park and ride service than to reduce the speed limit.

Why introduce a 20 mph speed limit and not a 25 mph speed limit? Speed is not always the killer in an accident; it is speed in the wrong time and place. Any changes undertaken to the speed limit in the city will need widespread consultation with emergency services and local residents. It is a concern that only the views of pressure groups and those with the loudest voices will be heard on this matter.

- 18.8b The panel thanked Councillor Denise Cobb for her time and contributions.
- 18.8c Members of the panel asked how many residents had responded to the questions which Councillor Denise Cobb had emailed.
- 18.8d The panel heard that in the short amount of time that was available about half a dozen had responded and their views were very informative.
- 18.8e Members of the panel asked for clarification as to whether Councillor Denise Cobb was representing the views of those residents which had responded to her email, or whether she was expressing her own views on this matter.
- 18.8f The panel heard that Councillor Denise Cobb was responding based on the views which she had gathered, but felt that a number of very important issues had been raised by the residents who had responded to her email. The rebuilding of the local environment to better incorporate traffic would be welcomed, and this especially needed to be applied to cycle routes. Cycle routes in the city need to be better planned and developed to ensure that cyclists do not cycle in the

wrong area. The city needs to be better developed to incorporate all of these changes.

- 18.8g Members of the panel asked for clarification as to whether 20 mph zones in the Westbourne/Poets Corner had been successful or not.
- 18.8h The panel heard that based on the information received from residents the speed bumps in the area didn't work as cars speed up in between the bumps and slow down to travel over the bumps. It is the same with speed cameras; drivers will slow down for the camera but will speed up once it has travelled past it. The success of any scheme introduced is down to enforcement and compliance.
- 18.8i The panel thanked Councillor Denise Cobb for her time and contributions.
- 18.9a **Evidence from Larry Halley, representing the Woodingdean Speedwatch Group**

It should be noted that Councillor Geoff Wells is a member of the Woodingdean Speedwatch Group; however, he was not present when this issue was discussed by the group.

About a year ago questionnaires were sent out to residents in Woodingdean. The returned questionnaires indicated that there was a perception that excessive speeding was occurring on side roads and main roads in the Woodingdean area. As a result of this perception the Woodingdean Speedwatch Group was set up to investigate the matter further. Speed tests have shown that on certain main roads in the area traffic speeds are currently in excess of 30 mph with speeds of 49 and 47 mph recorded. Speeds of over 40 mph were recorded on straighter parts of the road where the speed limit was supposed to be 30 mph. Interestingly when speeds were being monitored by the group, the speed of the traffic on the other side of the road which wasn't being monitored slowed down whilst some traffic in the lane being monitored were recorded as travelling at 40 mph.

The Woodingdean Speedwatch Group would not be in favour of 20 mph speed limits being introduced across the ward, as it would increase pollution in the area and 20 mph would not solve the problems on all the roads in the ward. Blocking one road in the area solved rat running in some areas of the ward. 20 mph restrictions on some roads in the area and around some schools would work, but there are other traffic problems which exist such as drivers stopping on zig zag lines.

The groups' main concern is that speed limits in the area would, if enforced effectively, probably be suitable; whether enforced by police officers or by physical engineering. Where the narrowing of roads has been undertaken it does appear to work and slow traffic down. In other cities chicanes have been widely introduced and they also appear to

slow traffic down. It is the physical environment that needs to change to encourage more appropriate driving.

The evidence collected by the Woodingdean Speedwatch Group shows that there are problems with speeding traffic in the area. Out of the five speed watches the group has undertaken, traffic was recorded as speeding on two occasions. However, other drivers who were not speeding sometimes slowed down so much during the speed watched they caused problems.

- 18.9b The panel thanked Larry Halley for his time and contributions.
- 18.9c Members of the panel noted that there is definitely a problem with rat running in the Woodingdean ward which is exacerbated by the number of pedestrians trying to cross many of the roads in the area. Speed has also been a historical problem in the area. It was asked as to whether the Woodingdean Speedwatch Group felt if there were particular types of traffic calming measures which would be appropriate for the Woodingdean area.
- 18.9d The panel heard that the Woodingdean Speedwatch group didn't have a particular opinion on the matter. However from the representatives' personal perspective it was noted that the road restrictions introduced in Bexhill had helped to slow the traffic. One problem with chicanes is that scooters and small vehicles can still speed through them. One thing to note was that the Woodingdean Speedwatch Group has only been able to work at certain times; they can not monitor traffic in the evenings. Chicanes and other physical restrictions are in the roads 24 hours day so may work to slow traffic in the evenings when police officers are less likely to be about.
- 18.9e Members of the panel asked as to whether the Group had any evidence to suggest that a blanket 20 mph across the city wouldn't work. It was noted that if police could enforce the current limits then this would be a great help to residents living in areas with speeding traffic. However, seeing as there is a perception that the police do not enforce the current speed limits and would not enforce 20 mph speed limits then introducing lower limits may not make much difference to the situation. The physical environment may need to be changed to influence drivers to drive more slowly.
- 18.9f The panel heard that changing the physical environment is the key to success across the city. Examples from cities in Europe show that if you change the physical environment then traffic has to slow down regardless of the time of day and the conditions on the road. However, this is an expensive option to take.
- 18.9g Members of the panel asked if chicanes can sometimes cause traffic to travel faster as cars end up competing for road space.

- 18.9h The panel heard from the Road Safety Manager that yes sometimes cars will speed up to get through a chicane before an oncoming vehicle. This tends to be more of a problem however when traffic is light, at peak times it is less of a problem. The distance between chicanes, as well as other types of traffic calming measures, is what often causes the problems of speeding up and slowing down traffic within a 20 mph zone.
- 18.9i The panel heard that in Ditchling because of the large number of parked cars and other restrictions in the area the traffic has slowed down.
- 18.9j Members of the panel noted that in Ditchling chicanes are indeed in place but the large amount of congestion which is caused by parked cars appears to have had a bigger impact on slowing traffic than the chicanes have had. It was also noted that in an area such as Woodingdean physical measures are likely to provide a solution to speeding traffic. However, due to the expense of 20 mph zones with traffic calming measures and due to the large demand for zones in the city, 20 mph areas with signs only may need to be considered as an option. Traffic calming could then be introduced should a 20 mph speed limit not change the attitude of drivers.
- 18.9k The panel heard that throughout Woodingdean there are a number of signs in place to inform drivers that there is a speed camera in the area and that speed checks are taking place. However there are drivers that will still speed through the cameras. There is a minority of drivers who will always speed no matter what is done.
- 18.9l The panel thanked Larry Halley for his time and contributions.

18.10a Evidence from Mag Morris, representing Friends of Queens Park/Queens Park Local Action Team

There is a general view within the Queen's Park area, supported by up to 50 recent emails on this matter, that traffic calming measures would be welcomed to slow down traffic. In particular, something needs to be done to slow traffic in the East and West Drive. There is not so much a problem of rat running in the area, but there is a problem with boy racers. There are a lot of cars parked around Queens Park, and there is a chicane in place on West Drive at the junction with Albion Road. This means that traffic from the northern end of the Queens Park area tends to slow as it travels south. However, as there are parked cars on only one side of the road further south, the traffic will speed back up again before slowing down by the archway. There is a problem of speeding and slowing traffic in the area with vehicles not travelling at a constant and manageable speed.

There are no 20 mph speed limits in the Queens Park area. The area has a number of nursery and primary schools and so the streets are

very crowded with lots of pedestrians trying to cross the roads. There are no signs in the area to indicate that there are children about so something needs to be done to slow the traffic down. During school time and during the school holidays it can be really quite dangerous. There have been no fatal accidents in the area; however traffic calming is wanted to prevent one from happening. Residents would have a preference for not having speed humps in the area but some other form of traffic calming measure.

There should be a 20 mph speed limit around the park and the adjoining streets, may be even on Queens Park Road as traffic tends to speed on this road, but there shouldn't be speed limits on the bigger roads such as Eastern Road. No residents thought that it would be a good idea for 20 mph speed limits to be introduced across the city.

18.10b The panel thanked Mag Morris for her time and contributions.

18.10c Members of the panel noted that boy racers in the area sounded like an immediate problem which needed to be addressed and enquired as to whether a mobile speed camera in the area would help the problem.

18.10d The panel heard that this may be a good idea as drivers do tend to tear around the park and its adjoining roads. There is a one way street just off the park and drivers often do not realise this as they are travelling too fast and as a result the one way system is often ignored and an accident is quiet likely to happen in that area very soon. May be a camera would also deter this kind of behaviour.

18.10e Members of the panel noted the potential of a 20 mph speed limit to solving some of the problems in the area around Queens Park particularly the problems with speeding. It was asked as to whether a 20 mph speed limit indicated by signs only would be welcomed in the area.

18.10f The panel heard that there are buses which use this area so 20 mph speed limits may be problematic. However a 20 mph speed limit on East, West and North Drive would definitely make life safer for many residents in this area. Friends of Queens Park and the Queens Park LAT have received many concerns about traffic around the park and the schools and about trying to cross some of the roads in the area. Something needs to be done.

18.10g The panel thanked Mag Morris for her time and contributions.

18.11a **Heike Feldpausch, representing the Lewes Road for Clean Air Group**

Lewes Road for Clean Air (LR4CA) has submitted a written statement about their views on 20 mph speed limits and zones. The LR4CA are local residents and people who use the Lewes Road. The group's aims

are to breathe clean air, help prevent climate change and further improve the quality of life and strength of the local community. The group currently has about 300 members. The LR4CA supports 20 mph speed limits across Brighton in built-up area for four key reasons. These are: to improve air quality, to increase road safety, to increase people's confidence in being able to cycle and walk in the city, and to encourage stronger communities with safer and cleaner roads.

The LR4CA campaigns for new ways to improve air quality for all residents in their neighbourhood. There are a number of residential roads in the area which currently have speed bumps. However the LR4CA group feels that a general 20 mph speed limit signified by signs rather than bumps would be a critical factor in trying to reduce the speed of traffic and improve air quality. A reduction in the general speed of traffic would cut down the current practise of braking and accelerating between road obstacles used to calm traffic and road junctions. Braking and accelerating is noisy and can lead to increases in emissions of harmful particulates, other pollutants and carbon. A steady speed of 20 mph is likely to reduce emissions, pollution and noise.

The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents suggests that a pedestrian struck at 20 mph has a 97% chance of survival. At 35 mph this falls to just a 50% chance of survival. Children are the most vulnerable type of pedestrian and they stand to benefit the most from a lowering of the limit to 20 mph. Living streets note that historically the 30 mph speed limit was introduced in 1934 when there were just 2 million cars in the UK. Today there are over 28 million. This is roughly one car for every two people in the UK. From a crossing the road point of view, 30 mph was a far more appropriate speed in the 1930s than it is today. The relative rarity of a car on the street meant that crossing it in good time was a simple matter. With today's increased car use, sufficient gaps in 30 mph traffic are much harder to come by, and on the main arterial roads in this city one could venture a guess to say that there are no gaps. A 20 mph speed limit puts people first and gives them the confidence to cross the road where they live without fear for their safety.

Other cities across the UK; London, Portsmouth, Norwich, Warrington, Leicester, Newcastle and Hull have all introduced 20 mph speed limits. A 20 mph speed limit in built-up area allows for the safe mixing of motorised and non-motorised people. It ensures equality in that it makes it easier for pedestrians and cyclists to enjoy the same direct and safe routes for their journeys as motorists. Anecdotal reports suggest that many cyclists are put off cycling because of the speed and volume of traffic. LR4CA believe that slower moving vehicles will encourage a voluntary modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport. The LR4CA group believes that the volume and speed of traffic through residential areas divides and weakens communities. A study from the Commission for Integrated Transport in 2001 found that

where cities have 20 mph speed limits covering between 65% and 85% of the street network, they are transformed from being noisy, polluted places into vibrant people-centred environments. The Hanover area which has had a 20 mph limit for about 15 years shows the value of 20 mph schemes. It was the first area in Brighton & Hove to have a limit and in that sense it was a pioneer. It has made the area safer for children and pedestrians, it has reduced rat running and thus made it more pleasant to walk around.

A greener, cleaner, and more traffic calmed city is not only more beneficial to the health of its residents, but it is also likely to be a more attractive destination for visitors and tourists. The LR4CA would urge the council to adopt a citywide 20 mph speed limit and to include this measure in the Sustainable transport Strategy for our city.

18.11b The panel thanked Heike Feldpausch for her time and contributions.

18.11c Members of the panel noted that due to the volume of traffic, traffic already moves quite slow in the Lewes Road area. The problem instead appears to be cars turning off Lewes Road, because of the number of traffic lights in the area, and speeding through the side streets. As Lewes Road is already an Air Quality Management Area slowing down the traffic any further in that area won't necessarily make it any cleaner.

18.11d The panel heard that LR4CA were aware that many cars driving at lower speeds are not necessarily more efficient. However, one option to take would be to reward car drivers travelling at 20 mph with, for example, a green wave of traffic lights, particularly at night when it is pointless to sit at traffic lights. A green wave for traffic travelling at a constant speed has been tried and tested successfully in Islington. LR4CA supports for definite 20 mph on residential roads and would ideally like to see 20 mph speed limits on arterial roads along with some sort of scheme to avoid criminalising drivers.

18.11e Members of the panel noted that the LR4CA appeared to be indicating that they wanted an extension to the approach used in Hanover to residential streets off Lewes and London Road, the use of a green wave system to help traffic to keep moving and, an over arching policy of removing unnecessary traffic journeys in the area, and that such measures would probably help solve the air quality problem in the Lewes Road area.

18.11f The panel heard that this was the case. If a 20 mph speed limit was introduced across the city there would probably be less cars on the roads as local people will not be quite so tempted to make small journeys by car. Lower emissions and pollution are thus achieved by less cars being on the road as a result of speed restrictions.

18.11g Members of the panel asked if the LR4CA group would be willing to

accept that there may be increases in pollution levels if speed limits were dropped from 30 to 20 mph.

18.11h The panel heard that members of the LR4CA are aware that a vehicle travelling at a lower speed is not a less polluting car, however, by introducing a lower traffic speed and by encouraging a steadier flow of traffic and having a no idling policy whereby cars have to be turned off when stationary, as well as other smart measures, then this will help to reduce pollution levels.

18.11i Members of the panel noted that they had heard evidence from the council's air quality officers to suggest that a modal shift in transport use in the city would help to reduce levels of pollution and increase air quality. It was asked as to whether there LR4CA supported 20 mph speed limits with signs only in residential areas and arterial roads.

18.11j The panel hear that ideally arterial roads should be reduced to 20 mph, however, this may be a lot to ask for, so for the time being, the group were mainly calling for 20 mph speed limits on residential roads. It was noted that a more in-depth study or survey on this issue would better reveal what residents in the area would be willing to support, and the LR4CA would be very happy to undertake or support such a project.

18.11k The panel thanked Heike Feldpausch for her time and contributions.

18.12 The panel thanked everyone who had attended today's meeting to represent the views of some of the residents groups from across the city.

18.13 The Panel noted that this concluded the public evidence gathering process of the panel and that the next step of the scrutiny review would be to start drawing together the panel's conclusions and observations.

19 Any other business

19.1 None.

The meeting concluded at 12.00

