

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

**ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE AD
HOC PANEL - 20MPH SPEED LIMITS/ZONES**

10.00am 11 FEBRUARY 2010

COMMITTEE ROOM 3, BRIGHTON TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillor West (Chair)

Also in attendance: Councillors Mitchell, Watkins and Wells

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-GATHERING SESSIONS

- 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, where as 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 head 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. DATE OF NEXT MEETINGS

14.1 Dates were confirmed as: 23 February 2010, at 10 am, Council Chamber, Hove Town Hall

15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

15.1 There was none.

The meeting concluded at 12.00pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of