



NOTICE OF MEETING

Scrutiny Review - 20 mph Speed Limit

MONDAY, 7TH FEBRUARY, 2011 at 10:45 HRS - CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH ROAD, WOOD GREEN, N22 8LE.

MEMBERS: Councillors Basu, Bull (Chair), Newton and Weber

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
2. **URGENT BUSINESS**
3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

A member with a personal interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that interest at the commencement of that consideration, or when the interest becomes apparent.

A member with a personal interest in a matter also has a prejudicial interest in that matter if the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the member's judgment of the public interest **and** if this interest affects their financial position or the financial position of a person or body as described in paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct **and/or** if it relates to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to them or any person or body described in paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct.

4. **MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 4)**

To agree the minutes of the meeting of 13 December 2010 (attached).

5. 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT (PAGES 5 - 16)

To agree conclusions and recommendations for the review. A paper summarising the main evidence received and highlighting suggested issues for discussion is attached.

6. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

Ken Pryor
Deputy Head of Local Democracy and Member
Services
5th Floor
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Robert Mack
Principal Committee Coordinator
Tel: 020 8489 2921
Fax: 020 8489 2660
E-mail: rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk

28 January 2011

**MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT
MONDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2010**

Councillors Bull (Chair), Newton and Weber

LC16. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Basu.

LC17. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

LC18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

LC19. MINUTES

AGREED:

That the minutes of the meeting of 15 November 2010 be approved.

LC20. 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT

The Panel received evidence from a number of community and residents organisations. They also received a written submission from 20s Plenty, which was circulated.

Firstly, the Panel received evidence from Paul Bumstead from the West Green Residents Association. The area was primarily residential in nature. The streets were often short and narrow and therefore speeds were normally comparatively low. There were nevertheless some exceptions to this, such as the link between Lordship Lane and West Green Road formed by Downhills Way and Belmont Road.

Transport for London (TfL) had originally not been favourable to lower speed limits but now appeared to be taking a more favourable approach. The DIY Streets programme was not supportive of physical calming. However, there was a need for lower speed limits to be self enforcing. Signage and appropriate road markings were preferable as well as being cheaper options.

Evidence was received from Chris Barker from the Sustainable Haringey Network, Haringey Living Streets and Haringey Federation of Residents Associations. He stated that the Police were not supportive of 20 mph speed limits unless they were enforced by physical impediments. Experience had shown that they brought speeds down by a little and they should therefore be considered as beneficial. As the 20 mph speed limit became more prevalent, it was possible that there would be a greater level of observance. Drivers would be more likely to live in an area with such a limit and therefore become used to it.

However, enforcement was not the most critical issue. Most people ignored the 30 mph speed limit. It was acknowledged that most people no one liked speed humps but streets that appeared to be long and open needed some means of reducing traffic

**MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT
MONDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2010**

speeds. Entry arches, narrower road sections and chicanes could be used. Vegetation could also be used, such as trees in pots. Such calming measures were not necessary where streets were narrow. If signage alone was found not to work, then physical calming measures could then be considered. It was acknowledged that enforcement was important but it would not be necessary for the Police to stop everyone who was exceeding 20 mph – it could be applied selectively. Speed guns were an excellent idea as were average speed cameras.

Councillor Weber stated that Police Safer Neighbourhood Team ward panels could set priorities for action by the Police. The process for this was driven by local residents.

Jennifer Bell from Hawthorn Road Residents Association stated that speeding was often a problem in her area. Nightingale Lane was narrow and motorists often speeded up after passing through it. She had written to complain about this but the response she had received had stated that accident rates were low and therefore there was no immediate need for action. She felt that it should not be necessary to wait until there was a fatality for action to be taken and that it would be beneficial to make a cultural change. She acknowledged that it would be difficult to stop “boy racers” from speeding but there were a lot of other people who were likely to be more receptive to lower speed limits. She felt that the default speed limit should be 20 mph in residential areas. A lower speed limit would make people feel safer and increase awareness amongst drivers.

David Rennie of the Crescent Road Residents Association felt that psychological traffic calming, such as trees being placed in close proximity to traffic, could be effective. Research had shown this to work well. One option that could be used was to place trees within concrete boxes. These also had the advantage of being moveable. Chevron parking and chicanes were other options but these could also result in the loss of parking space, which was not always popular.

Adam Coffman from Haringey Cycling Campaign stated that the SNT in his neighbourhood, which was Haringay, had been proactive in addressing traffic issues and used creative means of addressing the issue. However, the enthusiasm of the Police for addressing speeding was something of a post code lottery. He felt that pressure should be put on the Police to enforce lower speed limits. Speeding affected everyone and there should be a strong message given out that it was a serious issue. He noted that the DIY Street project was looking at alternatives to road humps but he was nevertheless still in favour of them. He felt that the main issue with road humps was that they were often not very well built. The project was looking at cheap ways to calm traffic and these could be used in other areas of the borough.

He felt that 20 mph speed limits were beneficial. They built confidence in cyclists. There was a correlation between low speed limits and the number of cyclists. For example, Germany and Denmark both had low speed limits and large numbers of people cycled. In contrast, the default speed limit in Australia was 60 kmh and there were fewer cyclists. A 20 mph speed default limit for Haringey would be consistent with the greenest borough strategy and be a brave move by the Council. It could be promoted in a number of ways such as car stickers and other publicity. In addition, Council employees could sign pledges to observe the 20 mph speed limit and Council vehicles required to observe it.

John MacBryde, from Kingsley Place Residents Association and Bus Watch West

**MINUTES OF THE SCRUTINY REVIEW - 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT
MONDAY, 13 DECEMBER 2010**

Haringey, reported on efforts being made to centralise access to bus services in Highgate Village. The angled parking that was used in certain areas was only feasible where there was a 20 mph speed limit. He felt that the Village area would benefit from a 20 mph speed limit.

It was noted that it was possible to have cross borough arrangements on speed limits so that any issues around borders could be resolved.

David Rennie drew attention to the removal of railings and road markings in areas of Kensington and Chelsea. As well as reducing speeds, these could make streets less cluttered and save money. Innovative schemes had the potential to work but relied on local councils being brave enough to adopt them. Damage caused to road surfaces by heavy vehicles was related to speed.

Debora Lucarelli from Hawthorn Road Residents Association felt that the Council needed to take into consideration a range of different options. There appeared to be a consensus that a 20 mph speed limit was a good idea. It was necessary to look at where problems occurred. There was not one single solution.

It was noted that the cost of implementing 20 mph zones was approximately £100,000 per mile. It would cost the same to implement 56 miles of a default 20 mph speed limit through signage alone. Councillor Weber reported that it had been stated that it would cost £600,000 to implement a 20 mph speed limit in Haringey. This compared to £10 million for implementing lower speeds through 20 mph zones. A number of other local authorities had undertaken this approach, such as Portsmouth, Bristol and Oxford. In streets where speeds were already low, drops in speed experienced were relatively small but bigger drops had been seen in areas where speeds had been higher.

Mr Barker felt that, given time, people would begin to drive slightly more slowly if there was a default 20 mph speed limit. For example, there was now a greater observance of the 30 mph speed limit than previously. Mr Coffman referred to two previous scrutiny reviews where there had been a consensus about the need for lower speed limits.

The Chair stated that, whilst the review panel was not able to make a decision on this issue, it would be making recommendations to the Council's Cabinet. The Panel thanked participants for their attendance.

**Clr Gideon Bull
Chair**

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY REVIEW – 20 MPH SPEED LIMIT

31 JANUARY 2011

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE REVIEW PANEL

ISSUES PAPER

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this paper is to bring together all of the significant evidence received in the course of the review and highlight the key issues for discussion at the concluding meeting.

Background

- 1.2 It has been established clearly that there is a link between traffic speed and road collisions. Excessive speed has been shown to be a direct contributory factor in about 20% of all collisions and a major factor on a third of all road deaths. This does not necessarily mean that drivers are breaking the speed limit but may instead be driving faster than appropriate for the conditions. Reducing speed limits has therefore been widely accepted as an important means of reducing road casualties. Research has shown that for every 1 mph reduction on average traffic speed, road collisions are reduced by 5%.
- 1.3 London boroughs have lead responsibility for changing and enforcing speed limits on minor roads in London whilst Transport for London (TfL) is responsible for major arterial roads. Many local authorities have introduced measures to reduce traffic speed to 20 mph. Nationally, police forces have generally been reluctant to enforce lower speed limits and there is an expectation that any such schemes should therefore be self enforcing. For example, the current policy of the Metropolitan Police is not to enforce 20mph speed limits except in exceptional circumstances.
- 1.4 Self enforcement has typically been through the use of physical calming features such as speed humps and cushions, speed cameras, width restrictions and chicanes. Research has shown that the more disruptive measures are the most effective;
- Signage alone reduces speeds by 1 mph
 - Road humps reduce average speed by 10 mph
 - Speed cameras reduce average speed by 20 mph

2. 20 mph Speed Limits

20 mph Zones

- 2.1 Until recently, the principal means used to reduce speed limits to 20 mph was through designating specific areas as 20 mph “zones”. These are areas where speed is restricted to 20mph by boundary signage and enforced by physical traffic calming measures. Although zones can be limited to a single road, they normally include a cluster of streets. There are

now around 400 of these in London, covering 11% of total road length. Their use has been targeted particularly at areas that are considered to be “high risk”, such as around schools and hospitals.

- 2.2 Evidence from Transport for London (TfL) has shown that 20 mph zones have been very effective in reducing road casualties. Casualties have gone down by 42% and fatal or serious casualties by 46% in streets where zones have been introduced. The impact has been particularly great in more deprived areas, which suffer higher road casualty figures.

Default 20 mph speed limits

- 2.3 A number of local authorities have considered introducing default 20 mph speed limits for entire areas. Some, such as Portsmouth City Council, Oxford City Council and the London Borough of Islington, have implemented specific schemes. As with a zone, a 20mph limit is applied to roads to restrict the maximum legal speed to 20mph. In streets not already within 20 mph zones and subject to physical calming measures, enforcement is by signage alone i.e. *without* any physical calming measures. The limits apply to all residential roads in a particular area.

DfT Guidance

- 2.4 The introduction of limits and zones is subject to specific Department for Transport (DfT) guidance which states that if the mean speed on a road is 24 mph or lower, a 20 mph speed limit can be set and enforced by signage alone. If mean speeds are any higher than this, physical calming measures should be used. The Metropolitan Police currently require that the relevant guidance is followed or appropriate exemption is sought for the Department for Transport
- 2.5 A scrutiny review on sustainable transport was undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in 2009/10. It recommended that the Council develop a borough wide 20 mph speed limit to be operational in all residential areas and, where appropriate, enforced by traffic calming measures. The recommendation was partially agreed by the Cabinet on the basis that a 20 mph speed limit in residential areas was only effective with physical measures to slow traffic.

3. Haringey Position

Current Council Policy

- 3.1 The Panel received a presentation from Tony Kennedy, the Group Manager for Transport Policy and Projects in the Urban Environment Directorate which outlined the Council’s current position. It noted that it was looking to further increase the number of areas with 20 mph speed limits. The overall policy had been discussed at the Council’s Transport Forum and received approval, in principle, from all user groups. The method of implementing such a limit was the main issue and, in particular;

- Whether it should be achieved by zones or limits
- Whether it should be in priority areas only

- The enforcement implications
 - The raising of public expectations
 - Financial implications
- 3.2 He stated that the option of achieving the speed reduction by speed limits and without physical calming measures was considerably cheaper than through zones - £600,000 to £1 million compared to £10 million. The Tower Gardens zone alone had cost £400,000.
- 3.3 The Council valued the benefits of 20mph and recognised its contribution to accident reduction, the perception of safer roads and encouragement of walking and cycling. Its current policy was to increase the number of 20mph zones in the borough through the neighbourhoods programme. This programme looked holistically at neighbourhoods with a view to providing physical measures and initiatives to make them safer and more pleasant.
- 3.4 As part of this approach, work was currently being undertaken on a scheme called DIY Streets. This was an initiative run by the sustainable transport charity Sustrans who had been contracted to work with the local community for 2 years in order to help residents develop low cost solutions to making streets safer and more attractive. It aimed to find simple interventions and materials which can be both effective and durable.
- 3.5 The neighbourhood to the south-east of Turnpike Lane station, which includes Langham Road, Carlingford Road, Stanmore Road and Graham Road, was being looked at this year. This was a pilot project and it was intended to roll it out in other neighbourhoods and to cover 2 to 3 each year, including 7 to 8 roads in each exercise. DIY Streets would look at possible ways forward, such as cycle training and car clubs, in order to try and change the way that people think. £68,000 had been invested in this so far. Residents led on the scheme and the intention would be that they would come up with an outline scheme for a bid to TfL. In addition, the Council had also set up a Sustainable Transport Commission to review its sustainable transport policies.
- 3.6 He stated that the London Borough of Islington was the only borough planning to implement a default 20mph limit on residential roads at the present time. The majority of their streets (78%) were already in 20 mph zones and there were already relatively low average speeds in the borough. It would be more difficult to follow such an approach on Haringey where only 30% of streets were in 20 mph zones. However, he felt that there might be some merit in introducing a pilot scheme in a street with an average speed of around 27/28 mph to see what happens.
- 3.7 In terms of a pilot scheme, it was noted that Wood Green was already slow and calmed. Green Lanes was also already fairly slow. Crouch End or Muswell Hill would probably be better options. It would be important to obtain measurable statistics so the effectiveness of the pilot scheme could be properly evaluated.
- 3.8 He had reservations that setting 20 mph speed limits without physical calming measures might raise expectations that could not be met. If a default limit was introduced across the borough, it probably would not be possible to enforce it. Whilst the Council had bought speed guns, training was still being awaited for Police Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs). SNTs also only worked until midnight. Average speed cameras could be used but were

currently very expensive, although the price was likely to come down. Flashing speed signs were introduced where needed and worked well. Mobile ones were available but needed to be manned.

Enforcement

- 3.9 Inspector Mark Long from the Police Safer Transport Team and Martin Young from the Traffic Police gave the Panel their views on 20 mph speed limits. Mr Long reported that the Police were not against the 20 mph speed limit in principle. The issue for them was how it was to be achieved and enforced. Policing resources were finite. Speed humps caused huge amounts of damage to police cars. He felt that signage alone would not be enough to reduce speeds. Whilst speeds in some side roads were relatively slow due to their narrowness, reducing speed would be a problem on wider roads.
- 3.10 Mr Young felt that signs alone would probably only reduce speeds slightly and many vehicles were likely to travel well in excess of the limit. There needed to be some means of enforcing limits. The Police were not able to enforce a 20 mph speed limit unless it was properly implemented using an engineered solution. However, if speeds were already under 24 mph, it was unlikely to be a major problem. This could be the case where streets were narrow. In such circumstances, there might not be the need for engineering measures.
- 3.11 It was noted that the government had relaxed the requirements for introducing 20 mph speed limits and it was now more a matter for local determination. However, local authorities would normally consult the police regarding enforcement. Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) had ward panels who decided upon priorities for their area and it was possible for them to make enforcement of speed limits one of these. 4 wards out of 19 in Haringey had already set traffic as a priority.
- 3.12 Mr Long stated that if SNTs were asked to focus on speeding, they would. Whilst they were supportive of the principle of 20 mph speed limits, they were concerned about enforcement. There was a balance between forcing traffic to slow down through physical measures and, if this did not work, through enforcement by the police. If there was likely to be a significant amount of additional enforcement required, it would not be possible for the police to commit the extra resources required. The Police would have a clear preference for engineering instead of enforcement as a solution.
- 3.13 Mr Young stated that the traffic police liaised with SNTs on a regular basis. If necessary, speeds could be monitored. It was quite often found that the reality did not match the perception that speeding was a problem in an area. Where an issue was identified, the information gathered could be used to decide whether an engineering solution or education was required.
- 3.14 Mr Young stated that properly engineered physical calming measures worked and removed the need for enforcement. Without them, the speed limit would only work with the aid of enforcement. Traffic issues needed to be investigated properly and expenditure focussed on where there had been collisions. He noted that there had only been a small number of collision sites in Portsmouth. If speed limits were brought in haphazardly, it could bring them into disrepute. Hackney was bringing in a borough 20 mph wide speed limit through a

patchwork of zones. He felt that this was a better way of achieving a 20 mph speed limit on a borough wide basis.

4. Evidence from Other Local Authorities

London Assembly

- 4.1 A London Assembly report entitled “Braking Point” looked at the issue of default 20 mph speed limits in detail. The report was of the view that there was, as yet, incomplete evidence to determine the potential effectiveness of default 20 mph speed limits. It concluded that there was a case for testing further the likely benefits and recommended that the Mayor work with boroughs planning to introduce default 20 mph limits to monitor their effectiveness and that the results of the programme should be published and used to inform future TfL and borough policy.
- 4.2 In terms of cost, the report noted that Islington were planning to spend £1 million to introduce a borough wide default limit. The cost of zones can vary considerably depending on their size and the enforcement measures that are used. The report quotes a range between £40,000 and £250,000. Southwark had calculated an average figure of £143,000 per zone and a total of £1.9 to cover the remaining 20 mph zones that it was planning.
- 4.3 The Panel received evidence from Jenny Jones, a Member of the London Assembly. As a member of its Transport Committee, she had played a leading role in the “Braking Point” investigation. She reported that each road death cost the economy approximately £1.5 million. Serious injuries could cost almost as much. Road casualties disproportionately affected children and people from black and ethnic minority and deprived communities. There was a general consensus that reducing speeds to 20 mph saved lives and this included motoring organisations such as the AA and the RAC. A reduction in speed of just 1 mph could lead to a significant reduction in road casualties.
- 4.4 She was of the view that having a default 20 mph speed limit made expectations clearer to people and simplified the issue. Physical calming measures had found by the Assembly to be very effective in reducing casualties. A further 900 were planned in London for future years. The move to default 20 mph speed limits was a logical and practical progression. However, the overall effectiveness of them had not yet been fully tested although the scheme in Portsmouth had been evaluated. In Hull, all of the individual zones had been joined together to produce an overall 20 mph speed limit. There was a need for such schemes to be accompanied by widespread public consultation.
- 4.5 Department of Transport advice was that a steady speed could improve traffic flow and reduce emissions. A 20 mph speed limit could have a small positive effect on this. There was a lack of research currently about whether lower speed limits had the potential to get people out of cars, although Hull had seen a huge increase in cycling following the implementation of its 20 mph scheme.
- 4.6 There were a range of views amongst London boroughs about the potential of default 20 mph speed limits:

- Eight boroughs had been actively pursuing the option
 - Other boroughs felt that further evidence was required on their impact
 - Some did not believe that they should be considered and were taking forward alternative approaches.
- 4.7 Other boroughs were intending to implement 20 mph speed limits on a piecemeal basis through introducing more 20 mph zones over a period of time until all their residential streets were covered. Hackney had wanted to extend its 20 mph speed limit to TfL roads as well, although permission from them would be required. The Mayor had previously agreed to fund the setting up of pilot 20 mph default speed limits in two boroughs. Hackney and Southwark had been interested and were ready to implement this. Hackney were no longer interested but Southwark still were and a potential agreement had been brokered. The Mayor had been asked for the funding but this had not yet been forthcoming.
- 4.8 The biggest sticking point had been the attitude of the Police. ACPO advice was not favourable to default 20 mph limits. The Police did not like road humps and preferred road narrowing or speed cameras. The Police view was that government guidance had to be followed and that they could not, in the normal course of events, enforce 20 mph speed limits. Nevertheless, residents could determine the priorities for Police Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) and speeding cars were nearly always amongst the top three concerns. Ms Jones was of the view that the Police had sufficient resources to pursue speeding issues. There was a feeling that traffic policing was not proper policing and attempts had been made to cut funding.
- 4.9 The transport research laboratory had shown that there could be more emissions at 20 mph. However, less emissions were produced where traffic moved at a steady speed. Ms Jones felt that the speed limit should be 20 mph everywhere except for main roads. In her view, 20 mph speed limits reduced the level of road danger and delivered significant cost benefits to communities.

Portsmouth

- 4.10 Portsmouth was the first local authority to introduce a default 20 mph limit on all residential roads. On most of the roads where the speed limit signs and road markings were installed, the average speeds before installation were less than or equal to 24 mph. The relatively low speeds on these roads before the implementation of the scheme were mainly due to the narrow carriageways and on-street parking that are common within the city, which reduces the effective width. 20 mph signs were also provided on roads with median speeds greater than 24 mph in order to avoid inconsistency and confusion. These were not accompanied by any physical calming measures. As this was contrary to the Department for Transport guidance, special dispensation from the Secretary of State needed to be obtained before implementation.
- 4.11 An independent evaluation of the scheme was published by the Department for Transport in September 2010. The evaluation found that the average speed after the 20 mph speed limits were imposed was 1.3 miles per hour lower than the average speed beforehand. At sites where the average before speed was greater than 24 mph, the average speed reduced by 6.3 mph. Despite a reduction in the number of sites with average speeds above 24

mph, which was 21 before the schemes implementation, 19 sites were found to still have average speeds between 24 mph and 29 mph after the schemes were implemented. The changes were regarded as being statistically significant.

Average Traffic speed changes after 20 mph speed limit implementation

Sector	Average Before Speed (mph)	Average After Speed (mph)	Speed Change (mph)
Central West	20.2	19.1	-1.1
South East	19.6	18.6	-1.0
Central East	18.5	17.9	-0.6
North East	18.2	16.4	-1.8
South West	18.4	16.9	-1.5
North West	23.9	22.2	-1.7
All Sectors	19.8	18.5	-1.3

4.12 The analysis showed the total accident reduction was 21% and the number of casualties fell by 22%. The number of killed or seriously injured (KSI) accidents increased by 8% and casualties by 6%. However, the total numbers of KSI accidents were very small and therefore susceptible to variations. These figures compare against a national reduction in casualty rates of 14% and of 12% in KSI casualties.

4.13 The evaluation came to the following conclusion:

“early figures suggest that the implementation of the 20 mph Speed Limit scheme has been associated with reductions in road casualty numbers. The scheme has reduced average speeds and been well-supported during its first two years of operation.”

4.14 In summary, the report states that the effects of implementing the 20 mph Speed Limit scheme (use of signing alone) were as follows:

- “The average speed reduction achieved by installing speed limit signs alone is less than that achieved by the introduction of 20 mph zones partly because 20 mph Speed Limits are implemented where existing speeds are already low;
- Within an area-wide application of 20mph sign only limits, those roads with average speeds higher than 24 mph may benefit from significant speed reductions, but not to the extent that the 20mph speed limit is self enforcing;
- Based on the available data for two years after scheme implementation, casualty benefits greater than the national trend have not been demonstrated”;

Islington

4.15 The Panel met with Zahur Khan, Bram Kainth and Michelle Thompson from the London Borough of Islington. Islington had completed its programme of setting up 20 mph zones in 2009. It had then been decided to extend 20 mph speed limit to the remaining 22% of the borough’s roads not covered by zones through the use of signage alone. The Council’s

Cabinet had made this decision but there was unanimous cross party support. The Council's new administration had re-affirmed this position.

- 4.16 There had been strong cross party support for reducing traffic speeds. This had initially been through the setting up of 20 mph zones. The number of accidents had gone down from 227 in 2001 to 71 last year following the implementation of them. The most dangerous streets within the borough had been done first. There normally had to be an accident before any action could be taken. The approximate cost of an accident was £80,000. Schemes had to demonstrate to TfL that they were cost effective. The original plan had been to extend 20 mph zones to every part of the borough and there had been a programme to do this until 2016 but this had been built on the assumption of there being continued funding.
- 4.17 The implementation of a default 20 mph speed limit had cost £1 million initially. However, the Department for Transport (DfT) and the Police had advised that the signs should all be illuminated and this had added another £600,000 to the cost. This was contrary to the approach that Portsmouth had adopted with the setting up of their scheme as the signage used there was not illuminated. The costs of the scheme came more from excluding particular roads as illuminated repeater signs were needed where speed limits changed. If signs were not properly illuminated, it might cause any prosecutions to fail. The DfT had worked closely with Islington on the implementation of their scheme.
- 4.18 It was doubtful whether the streets that had not been incorporated into 20 mph zones would have received funding. Residents appeared to generally feel safer and happier about their area following implementation of a lower speed limit. A traffic survey would be undertaken to evaluate how well the new scheme worked. This would use radar technology and be undertaken during the first 18 months.
- 4.19 Reducing traffic speeds could, conversely, reduce journey times through increasing the capacity of roads. This had been tried on both the M1 and M25 and had shown to be effective. The issue of whether to put main roads in the scheme was controversial and would be reconsidered after the scheme had been reviewed. The Police had generally been supportive. Safer Neighbourhood Teams (SNTs) would deal with any issues arising from complaints in relation to speeding. The Police had admitted that they were not even able to enforce the 30 mph speed limit.
- 4.20 They felt that, before implementing a scheme such as this, local authorities needed to ask themselves what their criterion for success was – whether it was reducing speed and accidents or increasing the perception of safety or making people feel happier about their environment. They were of the view that it was not a road safety issue. Traffic calming was the most effective way of addressing this. Although there was not much evidence available on the effectiveness of default 20 mph speed limits, that which there was showed that they made a minimal difference. They could not recommend a default 20 speed limit as professionals as it would not reduce accidents or speeds.
- 4.21 However, the lower speed limit could nevertheless deliver some benefits. It might make residents feel happier about their area. The lower speed limit could also possibly make it possible to prosecute people for driving at 29 – 30 mph. Where default 20 mph speed limits had been implemented, reductions in traffic speed had been bigger in streets areas where

speeds had been comparatively high before implementation but this might not be sustainable.

- 4.22 It was not possible to say whether the lower speed limit would increase cycling or walking. There was also no evidence so far the default 20 mph speed limits led to a step change in the psychology of drivers. It was nevertheless hoped that speeding would eventually become as unacceptable as drink driving. If it was possible to get the Police to enforce 20 mph speed limits, there was a chance that they might work.
- 4.23 There had been a backlash against speed humps and default 20 speed limits were probably more popular now. A large scale consultation exercise had been undertaken before their scheme had been implemented and 25% of the 40,000 people consulted had responded. Two thirds had been favourable. Residents would not be aware of average traffic speeds in their area so would be unable to quantify any improvement. The scheme could nevertheless be used to identify problem areas and help to change mind sets and would not do any active harm.
- 4.24 Officers had not been consulted prior to the introduction of the scheme but had been able to make it work effectively. Members had the right to ignore officer advice but their view had been that there was no factual evidence to support the policy. Given the choice, officers would spend what money was available on where particular problems had been identified. It would have cost £3 to £3.5 million to put the remaining part of the borough into 20 mph zones. This would have been undertaken in stages and not all at once. It could not be done now due to the financial climate.
- 4.25 There had been little negative feedback to the introduction of the scheme so far and there had only been good publicity. However, the lack of complaints from residents suggested that the policy had been ineffectual. There were some resources available for enforcement. Although 20 mph speed limits were cheaper to implement, there was still a significant cost. In the long term, it was possible that it would lead to a change in culture and mindset. It was noted that much less of Haringey was currently covered by 20 mph zones so implementing a similar scheme was likely to be more challenging.

5. Feedback from Community Organisations

- 5.1 The Panel received evidence from a number of community and residents organisations. They also received a written submission from 20's Plenty.
- 5.2 The view of Rod King, from 20's Plenty, was that in today's economic climate, value for money was very important. A comparison between traditional 20 mph zones and 20 mph limits was therefore an important one. In the past 20 mph zones had been used to target the streets most requiring speed reduction and in these cases had usually been effective. However they were expensive. 20's Plenty had done a comparison between the use of zones and limits and were of the view that 20mph speed limits were 7 times more cost effective than zones.
- 5.3 He highlighted the fact that Portsmouth had spent just £1,100 per km for limits compared to £60,000 per km for physically calmed zones. Comparing £100,000 spent within a community

with 50 miles of roads, they had found that 20 mph limits with signage alone gave better value for money than 20 mph zones. This was demonstrated by the following:

Option 1: Spending £100,000 on 20mph zones with physical calming; This would fund one mile of streets with a 20 mph zone with physical calming. Average speed was likely to drop by 9 mph. As the speed limit on the other 49 miles of roads remained the same, the average speed reduction across the whole network would be 0.18 mph.

Option 2: Spending £100,000 on 20mph limits without physical calming; This would fund 56 miles of streets with a 20mph limit and cover the whole community. The average speed reduction (based on the results of the Portsmouth evaluation) will be 1.3 mph.

- 5.4 From this, he concluded that 20mph area-wide limits were 7.2 times more cost effective than physically calmed zones. He stated that there are other benefits from community-wide limits such as the fact that they:
- Increase the collective ownership of lower speeds where people live.
 - Deliver a 20 mph street to most drivers, hence increasing value and compliance.
 - Provide a more consistent approach linked to road usage rather than road design.
- 5.5 He stated that there are now over 5m people living in Local Authorities who had adopted a 20 mph speed limit policy for all residential roads. He hoped that Haringey would be the next to be added to that list.
- 5.6 The Panel also received evidence from Paul Bumstead from the West Green Residents Association and, in particular, on the DIY Streets Scheme operating in the neighbourhood. The area was primarily residential in nature with streets that were often short and narrow and therefore traffic speeds were normally comparatively low. There were nevertheless some exceptions to this, such as the link between Lordship Lane and West Green Road formed by Downhills Way and Belmont Road. The DIY Streets programme was not supportive of physical calming. However, there was a need for lower speed limits to be self enforcing. Signage and appropriate road markings were preferable as well as being cheaper options.
- 5.7 Evidence was received from Chris Barker from the Sustainable Haringey Network, Haringey Living Streets and Haringey Federation of Residents Associations. Experience had shown that schemes enforced by signage alone could bring speeds down by a little and this approach should therefore be considered as beneficial. As the 20 mph speed limit became more prevalent, it was possible that there would be a greater level of observance. Drivers would be more likely to live in an area with such a limit and therefore become used to it. He felt that, given time, people would begin to drive slightly more slowly if there was a default 20 mph speed limit. For example, there was now a greater observance of the 30 mph speed limit than previously.
- 5.8 However, enforcement was not the most critical issue. Most people ignored the 30 mph speed limit. It was acknowledged that most people disliked speed humps but streets that appeared to be long and open needed some means of reducing traffic speed. Entry arches, narrower road sections and chicanes could were all options that could be used. Vegetation could also be used, such as trees in pots. Such calming measures were not necessary

where streets were narrow. If signage alone was found not to work, then physical calming measures could then be considered. It was acknowledged that enforcement was important but it would not be necessary for the Police to stop everyone who was exceeding 20 mph – it could be applied selectively. Speed guns were an excellent idea as were average speed cameras.

- 5.9 Jennifer Bell from Hawthorn Road Residents Association stated that speeding was often a problem in her area. Nightingale Lane was narrow and motorists often speeded up after passing through it. She had written to complain about this but the response she had received had stated that accident rates were low and therefore there was no immediate need for action. She felt that it should not be necessary to wait until there was a fatality for action to be taken and that it would be beneficial to make a cultural change. She acknowledged that it would be difficult to stop “boy racers” from speeding but there were a lot of other people who were likely to be more receptive to lower speed limits. She felt that the default speed limit should be 20 mph in residential areas. A lower speed limit would make people feel safer and increase awareness amongst drivers. Debora Lucarelli, also from Hawthorn Road Residents Association, felt that the Council needed to take into consideration a range of different options as there was not a single solution.
- 5.10 David Rennie of the Crescent Road Residents Association felt that psychological traffic calming, such as trees being placed in close proximity to traffic, could be effective. Research had shown this to work well. One option that could be used was to place trees within concrete boxes. These also had the advantage of being moveable. Chevron parking and chicanes were other options but these could also result in the loss of parking space, which was not always popular. He drew attention to the removal of railings and road markings in areas of Kensington and Chelsea. As well as reducing speeds, these could make streets less cluttered and save money. Innovative schemes had the potential to work but relied on local councils being brave enough to adopt them.
- 5.11 Adam Coffman from Haringey Cycling Campaign stated that the SNT in his neighbourhood, which was Harringay, had been proactive in addressing traffic issues and used creative means of addressing the issue. However, the enthusiasm of the Police for addressing speeding was something of a “post code lottery”. He felt that pressure should be put on the Police to enforce lower speed limits. Speeding affected everyone and there should be a strong message given out that it was a serious issue. He noted that the DIY Street project was looking at alternatives to road humps but he was nevertheless still in favour of them. He felt that the main issue with road humps was that they were often not well built. The project was looking at cheap ways to calm traffic and these could be used in other areas of the borough.
- 5.12 He felt that 20 mph speed limits were beneficial. They built confidence in cyclists. There was a correlation between low speed limits and the number of cyclists. For example, Germany and Denmark both had low speed limits and large numbers of people cycled. In contrast, the default speed limit in Australia was 60 kmh and there were fewer cyclists. A 20 mph speed default limit for Haringey would be consistent with the greenest borough strategy and be a brave move by the Council. It could be promoted in a number of ways such as car stickers and other publicity. In addition, Council employees could sign pledges to observe the 20 mph speed limit and Council vehicles required to observe it.

5.13 John MacBryde, from Kingsley Place Residents Association and Bus Watch West Haringey, reported on efforts being made to centralise access to bus services in Highgate Village. The angled parking that was used in certain areas was only feasible where there was a 20 mph speed limit. He felt that the Village area would benefit from a 20 mph speed limit. It was noted that it was possible to have cross borough arrangements on speed limits so that any issues around borders could be resolved.

Key Issues for consideration:

- What specific benefits should lower speed limits aim to deliver and what should be the success criteria of any scheme?
- Is there enough evidence available yet to demonstrate whether default 20 mph speed limits that are enforced without physical calming measures can deliver these?
- If not, how should sufficient evidence be generated and evaluated?
- Would it be of potential benefit to set up a scheme in Haringey and, if so, how should it be developed and implemented?