

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>Brighton and Hove 20mph Limit Phase 2 – Submissions made in response to Speed Limit Orders</b>		
<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	<b>04 March 2013</b>		
<b>Report of:</b>	<b>Executive Director of Environment Development and Housing</b>		
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	<b>Name:</b>	<b>Emma Sheridan</b>	<b>Tel: 29-3862</b>
	<b>Email:</b>	<b>Emma.sheridan@brighton-hove.gov.uk</b>	
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>	<b>All</b>		

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE.****1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to address comments and objections relating to the draft Speed Limit Orders (SLO). The orders outline the proposed introduction of a 20mph speed limit in the phase 2 area of Brighton and Hove.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That, having taken account of all duly made representations and objections, the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee approves as advertised the following orders

- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 1) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3a-2014)
- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 2) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3b-2014)
- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 3) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3c-2014)  
With the following amendment:  
That Copse Hill be removed from the Order for the reason set out in paragraphs 4.78 - 4.79
- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 4) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3d-2014)
- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 5) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3e-2014)
- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 6) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3f-2014)
- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 7) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3g-2014)
- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 8) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3h-2014)
- Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 9) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3i-2014)

- Brighton & Hove (Coldean Lane) (30mph Speed Limit) Order 201\* (TRO-3j-2014)
- 2.2 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising a formal Speed limit Order (SLO) to reduce to 20mph the speed limit on Dartmouth Crescent for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 4.41 – 4.44
  - 2.3 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising a formal Speed limit Order (SLO) to reduce to 20mph the speed limit on Surrenden Road for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 4.41-4.44
  - 2.4 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising a formal Speed limit Order (SLO) to reduce to 20mph the speed limit on Preston Drove for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 4.41 – 4.44
  - 2.5 That the Committee authorises officers to proceed with advertising a formal Speed limit Order (SLO) to reduce to 20mph the speed limit on Stanford Avenue for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 4.41-4.44
  - 2.6 That the Committee note the forward programme for the 20mph programme as outlined in paragraph 6.5
  - 2.7 That the Committee instructs officers to continue a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation programme to accompany and follow the implementation of the 20mph speed limits and to bring a report to Committee should such monitoring indicate that the introduction of the reduced speed limit has had a significant negative impact in line with objections raised

### **3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 3.1 In May 2010, following an investigation into 20mph speed limits and zones by the Environment and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee (ECSOSC), the panel produced a report containing 15 recommendations (see Background Document 1). In broad terms, the main recommendation was the wider implementation of 20mph speed limits in residential areas and on the roads outside schools, routes to schools, roads outside parks and playgrounds, sports and leisure facilities, community buildings, older people's care homes, local shops and on roads in busy shopping areas.
- 3.2 In October 2011, the Department for Transport (DfT) set out a new policy framework for the country's traffic sign systems. Included in this were provisions making it easier for councils to introduce 20mph schemes. This takes the form of a reduction in the need for physical traffic calming measures in 20mph zones by expanding the list of permitted traffic calming measures to include repeater signs and reducing the need for road humps and chicanes.
- 3.3 An outline proposal for the phased introduction of 20mph speed restrictions across the City was considered at the Environment Transport & Sustainability Cabinet Member Meeting in May 2012 where the principles of the proposed implementation programme (see Background Document 4) were agreed. Permission was granted to undertake city wide stakeholder and public

consultation, preparatory research, surveys and street character assessments.

- 3.4 On 15<sup>th</sup> January 2013 the Brighton & Hove City Council Transport Committee granted approval for the first phase of implementation of 20mph speed limit programme in central Brighton and Hove (see Background Document 6). The limit came into force on 8th April 2013.
- 3.5 On 11<sup>th</sup> December 2013 the Brighton & Hove City Council Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee granted approval for the advertisement of Speed Limit Orders for the Phase 2 area.

## **4 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION**

### **Petitions**

- 4.1 A petition signed by 742 people was presented to full Council in January 2014 asking Brighton and Hove City Council “To reconsider the decision not to reduce the speed limit on Preston Drive, Stanford Avenue and Surrenden Road to 20mph” Paragraph 4.44 below outlines the officer response to and recommendations linked to this petition.

### **Public Consultation**

- 4.2 Initial city wide public consultation on 20mph limits took place between 17th June and 10<sup>th</sup> August 2012. A total of 3689 people responded as part of the consultation with 55 % in favour and 44.5% against the proposal to introduce 20mph limits. Detailed results from this consultation are recorded in Background Document 5.
- 4.3 Speed Limit Orders for the Phase 1 area of central Brighton and Hove were advertised between 13<sup>th</sup> December 2012 and 3rd January 2013. Responses to the advertisement and officers responses to the issues raised are recorded in Background Document 6.
- 4.4 Public consultation on the Phase 2 area took place between 13th August and 4th October 2013. A total of 14,952 people responded as part of the consultation. A majority (51%) of people responded that they supported 20mph on their own street. This increased to 53% when only the responses from those living within the Phase 2 area were considered. Detailed results from this consultation are reported in Background Document 7.
- 4.5 The proposals for the Phase 2 areas were amended by officers in light of the results of public consultation such that under the amended proposals, 59% of people living in the Phase 2 area would have the speed limit they wanted for the street on which they lived.
- 4.6 The Phase 2 proposals were further amended by the Environment Transport & Sustainability Committee, in December 2013, to remove a small number of individual roads (Surrenden Road, Preston Drive, Stanford Avenue and Portland Road) and the residential area of Hollingbury.

### **Advertisement of Draft Speed Limit Orders**

- 4.7 The draft Speed Limit Orders (SLOs) for the Phase 2 20mph programme area were advertised on 24th January 2014 with the closing date for comments and objections being 14th February 2014.
- 4.8 The Ward Councillors for the areas were consulted, as were the Bus and Taxi Companies operating within the City and the statutory consultees such as the Emergency Services. The notices were published in The Argus newspaper and were available to view at the City Direct Offices at Bartholomew House and Hove Town Hall. The documents were available to view and respond to directly via the Council website. In addition, notification and copies of the orders were distributed by email to all those who had provided contact details for further information when responding to the public consultation on the Phase 2 area.

### **Stakeholder Meetings/Correspondence**

- 4.9 A meeting was held with senior officers of **Sussex Police** to discuss the 20mph programme, both implementation to date and future proposals, on 5th February 2014.
- 4.10 Following the meeting, a letter was received from Sussex Police in response to the advertisement of the orders. The letter took the unusual step of stating that Sussex Police have no objections to the proposals (normally where the Police have no objections they simply do not respond). The letter confirms that it is the opinion of Sussex Police that:
- The Phase 2 proposals do not constitute a blanket approach and have been tailored to suit each of the areas concerned
  - They are reassured of the post monitoring programme and that it will be used to evaluate the success of the scheme and identify further measures where they might be needed
  - They have no objections to the Phase 2 20mph proposals nor to the reduction of speed on Coldean Lane from 40mph to 30mph.
- 4.11 A letter was received from Brighton and Hove Bus and Coach Company in response to the advertisement of the Orders. The letter confirmed that they were able to support the proposals as a result of the retention of existing limits on a number of roads. These roads were; Portland Road, New Church Road, Shirley Drive, Dyke Road, Dyke Road Avenue, London Road, Preston Road, Braybon Avenue, Winfield Avenue, Carden Avenue, Carden Hill, Ditchling Road (north of Fiveways), Lewes Road and Surrenden Road.
- 4.12 Further discussions took place with Brighton and Hove Bus and Coach Company on 19th February 2014 specifically relating to Surrenden Road. Following these discussions, the Company's Managing Director confirmed that they "are satisfied that the exemption for Surrenden Road can be lost without significant detriment to the provision of bus services in the area." They further confirmed that they had not specified any issues on either Preston Drive or Stanford Avenue and that as such, they had no objections to the speed limits on these roads being reduced to 20mph.
- 4.13 A letter was received from Bricycles and CTC in response to the advertisement of orders. The letter confirmed support for the 20mph Speed limit Orders on the

grounds of the “overwhelming evidence” that they would reduce road danger for cyclists and pedestrians. The letter objected to the exclusion of individual streets citing the additional costs this would incur and the confusion this would cause. In particular Bicycles objected to the exclusion of:

- Portland Road (a busy shopping street with high numbers of pedestrians and cyclists and a poor safety record)
- Road around public parks including Hove Park and Hove Recreation Ground
- The Westdene residential area
- Surrenden Road, Preston Drove and Stanford Avenue (due to their proximity to local schools and parks, that the Bus Company did not request their exclusion, and the strong local support for the limit to be lowered on these roads)
- The residential roads of Patcham and Hollingbury
- Ditchling Road north of Fiveways and the Fiveways junction itself (the location of a large secondary school)

4.14 The issues raised and responses to these exclusions are considered in paragraphs 4.27 - 4.44 of this report.

4.15 A response was received from The Campaign for Better Transport (East Sussex) in support of the proposals. The response in particular referenced the statement from the Commission for Integrated Transport regards the “fundamental” role of 20mph speed limits in the growth of cycling and walking and the health benefits that would be gained particularly for older people.

4.16 A letter was received from the Freight Transport Association in response to the advertisement of the Orders. The letter did not object directly to the proposals contained within the Orders but rather provided details of the FTAs general views on 20mph speed limits in general. The letter stated that the FTA believes that:

- 20mph schemes should not be applied in a simplistic or blanket fashion but should be targeted
- Un-enforcement of 20mph limits will result in speeds not reducing and greater speed differentials
- Where speeds are slowed across an area that this will increase costs for the logistics industry and will not provide benefits in terms of fuel use or local emissions
- There should be a full safety case for all measures proposed
- 20mph limits should be targeted to areas of concern and set to specific times of the day
- Full access to main roads must not be compromised

4.16 In response to the issues raised by the FTA, it is noted that the 20mph programme in the city:

- Has not been applied in a simplistic or blanket fashion, and that this has been recognised independently by not only Sussex Police (see paragraph 4.10) but also by the Advertising Standards Agency in a recent ruling (see appendix 2).
- Has the support of Sussex Police who are working in partnership with Council officers to ensure appropriate interventions are in place to secure compliance

- Has investigated and continues to investigate the impact of the programme on air quality
  - Understands and has considered carefully the safety and other motivating factors for the measures that are proposed and implemented
  - Has investigated the issue of part time speed limits fully and found this not to be a feasible or permitted option
  - Has maintained access to main arterials routes, at their existing limits
  - Has and will continue to be implemented in line with the Councils policies on the Control of Heavy Goods Vehicles.
- 4.17 The Principal Transport Planner offered to attend the Taxi Forum on 12th February 2014 to discuss the Phase 2 SLOs. No response was received to the offer made. No written or other response was received from the taxi trade to the advertised SLOs for Phase 2. .

### **Individual responses to the Speed Limit Orders**

- 4.18 In total, correspondence was received from 204 individuals in response to the 10 SLOs (hard copies of the responses are available to view in the Members Room and a summary is provided as Appendix 1)
- 4.19 The correspondence has been reviewed in order to understand the various reasons behind the support for, or objections to, the proposals. A number of submissions related to more than one issue. The number of times each issue has arisen is indicated below along with a response to each objection raised.
- 4.20 The majority of reasons provided for those supporting and opposing the proposals were the same as those raised during the public consultation on Phase 2 and previously with the advertisement of Speed Limit Orders for the Phase 1 area and the initial public consultation on the 20mph programme. These issues were addressed at length in the Committee Reports presented to and debated by the Transport Committee in January 2013 (Background Document 6) and by the Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee in December 2013 (Background Document 7). Members are referred to Background document 6 and 7 for the detailed responses in relation to these issues.

This report addresses in detail those issues which are new, those that are specific to the Phase 2 Speed Limit Orders and those where new evidence has become available.

### **Support for the Proposals**

- 4.21 **50** responses were received giving complete support to the proposals. In addition to stating general support for 20mph limits in principle, these submissions cited the following reasons for their support:
- Improved safety (particularly for children) (25 respondents)
  - Will encourage more walking and cycling (6 respondents)
  - Will create a more pleasant environment (6 respondents)
  - Will improve traffic flow (3 respondents)
  - Will reduce pollution and noise (6 respondents)
  - The limit was appropriate as areas were near or on routes to schools, in residential/family areas (31 respondents)
  - A feeling that current speeds were too fast (18 respondents)

Particular roads mentioned where the 20mph limit was supported were; Carden Avenue (1), Dyke Road Drive (4), The Drove (1), Hove Park Road (1), St Leonards Road (1), Peacock Lane (1), Freshfield Road (4), Balfour Road (1), Matlock Road (2), The Drove (10), Hove Park Road (6), Elrington Road (3), Radinden Manor Road (2), Ditchling Road (1), Southdown Road (1), Lloyd Road (2), Orpen Road (2), Sutherland Road (1), Evelyn Terrace (1), Tivoli Road (1)

### **Support and Objection to the Proposals**

- 4.22 **90** responses were received from residents who expressed support for the 20mph limits but also objected to the exclusion from the Orders of specific roads.
- 4.23 1 resident of Dartmouth Crescent objected to the fact that his road was not named in the list of streets advertised under Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 8) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3h-2014)
- 4.24 Dartmouth Crescent should have been listed in the draft orders. It is, therefore, recommended that this administrative error be corrected by permission being given to formally advertise an order for this street.
- 4.25 1 respondent requested the addition of the northern section of Freshfield Road under Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 8) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3i-2014) giving as a reason the use of this road at weekends when a car boot sale takes place at the Racecourse
- 4.26 This section of road was identified early in the investigative stages of the Phase as a road where the street character would not encourage self enforcement of a 20mph limit without extensive infrastructure measures being put in place, existing traffic speeds on this road supported this. It is not considered appropriate therefore to propose a reduction of the speed limit on this section of road.
- 4.27 1 resident of Hill Drive objected to the fact that their roads was not included in the list of streets advertised under Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 2) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\*(TRO-3b-2014)
- 4.28 As outlined in Background Document 7 paragraphs 4.49 – 4.50, it was very clear in the public consultation that the majority of respondents in this area did not wish to see 20mph limits on their streets. It is understood that this will be disappointing for those living in the area who wished to see 20mph introduced. Given that there was not a demonstrable level of local support in this residential area, it is however, considered unlikely that a lower limit could easily become self enforcing. Officers will however, continue to include the area in ongoing monitoring and should the level of public support for 20mph alter in the future a report could be brought to the committee on this.
- 4.29 6 respondents (4 resident in the West Hove area) objected to the fact that Portland Road was not included in the list of streets advertised under Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 1) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\*(TRO-3a-2014. Reasons provided were the dangerous nature of road traffic on the street, its casualty history, the fact that it was a busy shopping street with a local school and high levels of pedestrians and cyclists and the existence of 2 alternative, parallel routes in Old Shoreham Road and New Church Road to be used by road traffic.

- 4.30 The officer recommendation, as outlined in the Committee Report presented to the ETS Committee in December 2013 (Background Document 7: Paragraph 4.48), was that Portland Road be reduced to 20mph. However, at that meeting the Committee requested officers to undertake further analysis and monitoring of Portland Road. This is currently underway and a report on this street will be brought to a future ETS committee for consideration.
- 4.31 1 resident of New Church Road objected to the fact that their street was not included in the list of streets advertised under Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 1) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\*(TRO-3a-2014)
- 4.32 New Church Road was identified early in the investigative stages of Phase 1 as a road where the street character would not encourage self enforcement of a 20mph limit without extensive infrastructure measures being put in place, existing traffic speeds on this road supported this. In addition it was very clear in the public consultation that the majority of respondents in this area, including the majority of respondents who were resident on the street itself, did not wish to see 20mph limits on New Church Road. It is understood that this will be disappointing for those living in the area who may have wished to see 20mph introduced, however, given that there was not a demonstrable level of local support, it is considered unlikely particularly given investigative findings about the road, that a lower limit could easily become self enforcing. Officers will however, continue to include the area in ongoing monitoring and should the level of public support for 20mph alter in the future a report could be brought to the committee on this.
- 4.33 4 respondents (1 resident in Westdene) objected to the majority of streets in the Westdene area not being included in the list of streets advertised under Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 2) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\*(TRO-3c-2014)
- 4.34 As outlined in Background Document 7 paragraphs 4.51 – 4.53, it was very clear in the public consultation that the majority of respondents in this area did not wish to see 20mph limits on their streets. It is understood that this will be disappointing for those living in the area who wished to see 20mph introduced. Given that there was not a demonstrable level of local support in this residential area, it is however, considered unlikely that a lower limit could easily become self enforcing. Officers will continue to include the area in ongoing monitoring and should the level of public support for 20mph alter in the future a report could be brought to the committee on this.
- 4.35 6 respondents (3 resident in the area) objected to the streets in Goldstone Valley, in particular Goldstone Crescent and Shirley Drive, not being included in the list of streets advertised under Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 2) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\*(TRO-3b-2014)
- 4.36 As outlined in Background Document 7 paragraphs 4.49 – 4.50, it was very clear in the public consultation that the majority of respondents in this area did not wish to see 20mph limits on their streets. It is understood that this will be disappointing for those living in the area and those who use the park located here, who wished to see 20mph introduced. Given that there was not a demonstrable level of local support in this residential area, it is however, considered unlikely that a lower limit could easily become self enforcing. In addition Shirley Drive was a particular

road of concern for the bus company. Officers will continue to include the area in ongoing monitoring and should the level of public support for 20mph alter in the future a report could be brought to the committee on this.

- 4.37 13 respondents (5 resident in the Patcham and Hollingbury Area) objected to exclusion of residential streets within the Patcham and Hollingbury area in particular Carden Hill and Braybon Avenue from the list of streets advertised under Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 5) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\*(TRO-3e-2014). Particular reasons provided for this included the large number of school children, families and older people resident in the area.
- 4.38 The officer recommendation, as outlined in the Committee Report presented to the ETS Committee in December 2013 (Background Document 7: Paragraph 4.55) was that further roads in this area be reduced to 20mph. The Committee took a decision at that meeting to defer any lowering of speed limits in this area until such time as a more demonstrable level of support for such a move could be evidenced. It is proposed, therefore, that officers will continue to include the area in ongoing monitoring. Should the level of public support for 20mph alter in the future, a report could be brought to the committee on this. It is understood that this will be disappointing for those living in the area who wished to see 20mph introduced.
- 4.39 7 respondents (3 resident in the local area) objected to the retention of existing speed limits on Ditchling Road north of Fiveways and the Fiveways Junction itself. The principle reason for this was the location of the Vardean Campus.
- 4.40 This section of Ditchling Road was identified early in the investigative stages of Phase 2 as a road where self enforcement of a 20mph limit without extensive infrastructure measures being put in place may be difficult to achieve. Existing traffic speeds on this road supported this. Officers will, however, continue to include the area in ongoing monitoring and should the level of public support for 20mph on this section increase in demand the suitability of this section could be reviewed with the potential for a report be brought to the committee on this. It should be noted however, that it would be expected that any further reductions in speed limit along this road would be opposed by the Bus Company.
- 4.41 A large number of respondents objected to the exclusion three specific roads in the Preston area – namely the full length of Surrenden Road ( 69 respondents) , Preston Drove (73 respondents) and Stanford Avenue (72 respondents) ( from Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 4) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\*(TRO-3d-2014) and Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 5) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\*(TRO-3e-2014).
- 4.42 The principle reason for the objections was the location of a large number of schools on this road and on the surrounding roads resulting in a large number of school children and families travelling along this residential street. It was noted that only a small number of buses used the area and its exclusion created an inconsistency of speed limit in the local area that could see speeds increase dangerously. The point was also made that the exclusion of these streets would greatly increase the signage costs of implementation in this area. It is important to note that of those who objected to the exclusion of these roads the majority

where resident upon them or on adjoining roads. The introduction of a 20mph limit on these roads has the support of local ward councillors also.

4.43 Brighton and Hove Bus and Coach Company have confirmed as stated in paragraph 4.12 of this report that they would not now object to a 20mph limit on Surrenden Road and that they had never had any objection to the lower limit on Preston Drove or Stanford Avenue.

4.44 The officer recommendation, as outlined in the Committee Report presented to the ETS Committee in December 2013 (Background Document 7: Paragraph 4.54), was that Surrenden Road, Preston Drove and Stanford Avenue be reduced to 20mph. In view of the high number of objections (including the petition referred to at 4.1 above) and the views of the bus company, Committee authorization is sought for officers to proceed with advertising a formal Speed limit Order (SLO) to reduce to 20mph the speed limit on the full length of these roads.

### **Objections to the Proposals**

4.45 63 responses were received in complete objection to the proposals.

### **20mph Limits Not Necessary**

4.46 22 respondents objects to the orders in general stating that the lower limits were unnecessary either because the existing limits were more than appropriate for the roads (specific roads mentioned by individual respondents included Bear Road, Eastern Road, Freshfield Road, Whitehawk Road, Arundel Road, Whitehawk Way and Ditchling road) or because it was impossible to exceed 20mph in the city. It was not uncommon for individual objectors to include both statements within their objection.

4.47 There are numerous documented reasons why Local Authorities undertake the investigation, proposal and where appropriate implementation of 20mph speed limits which have been outlined and discussed in all the Background Documents listed. The most basic is that Department of Transport guidance on speed limit recommends it, but more meaningful reasons are found in the safety improvements that they can bring in terms of reductions in collisions and the severity of casualties and the sense of place that can be returned to streets. Brighton and Hove has got concerning levels of collisions and casualties in some areas of the city that slowing down traffic speeds should have a significant impact on reducing. In addition the city has a population who increasingly wish to see their neighbourhood streets as places rather than thoroughfares. Improving the city streets so that they are more pleasant, safer places to live, work and visit is considered a worthwhile ambition. The reasons behind the inclusion of particular areas and individual roads is covered in detail in Background document 7.

### **Lack of Evidence/Monitoring of success of Phase 1**

4.47 13 respondents objected to the Orders on the grounds that the first phase of the 20mph programme was not working or achieving its aims. This included statements that the 20mph limit, where it had already been introduced, was being ignored by drivers, that speeds had not reduced, that the lower limit had made roads more dangerous (1 respondent particularly mentioned the safety of motorcyclists and 6 suggested that it was encouraging pedestrians to cross

roads more confidently and that this was dangerous) and that the objector simply did not believe the Council had any evidence against which to gauge success of the scheme.

4.48 Details of casualty and collision data within in the Phase 1 area was presented at the December ETS Committee (Background Document 7: paragraph 4.35). Further collision and casualty data has become available. Such figures can be provided for the first 8 months of the 20mph becoming operational in the Phase 1 area. As can be seen from Figure 1 below, within the Phase 1 area there have been no fatal collisions since the implementation of the 20mph limit and overall there has been a decrease in the number of collisions and in the number of casualties based on 8 months of 2013 data compared with the 3 year average for the same months in the previous three years.

4.49 As was the case when earlier figures were presented to the Committee in December 2013, it should be noted that the figures here can only be considered indicative at this stage and in order to have truly statistically robust data it is preferable to have 3 full years of monitoring data as this will ensure that findings are not skewed by seasonal variations or unique/one off events. However, these interim results continue to be in line with the positive results seen by other cities and are an encouraging indication of success even at this early stage.

4.50 Figure 1: Casualty Figures 8<sup>th</sup> April to 7<sup>th</sup> December

<b>All Collisions by Severity</b>		
	<b>3 yr average 2010 - 2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
<b>Fatal</b>	0.3	0
<b>Serious</b>	36.0	34
<b>Slight</b>	187.7	157
<b>TOTAL</b>	224.0	191
<b>All Casualties</b>		
	<b>3 yr average</b>	<b>2013</b>
<b>Fatal</b>	0.3	0
<b>Serious</b>	36.0	34
<b>Slight</b>	227.3	196
<b>TOTAL</b>	263.7	230

4.51 With specific regard to Motorcycle safety within the Phase 1 area it is encouraging also that interim data to date has shown a decrease in both collisions and casualties for this group. Again though it should be noted that data at this stage can be regarded as indicative only.

#### **Air Quality, Pollution and Emissions**

4.52 21 objections stated that the lower speed limit would result in increased pollution and a deterioration of air quality and included assertions that cars would need to be driven in lower gears and that fuel consumption would be increased.

4.53 It remains the case that evidence is limited on this topic and this issue has been explored in background doc 7 paragraphs: 4.37 – 4.39 and background

document 6 paragraph 4.26 – 4.28. In summary, the most recent available research on this topic, undertaken by Imperial College London, found that “it would be incorrect to assume that 20mph speed restrictions would be detrimental to air quality...[and]... air quality is unlikely to be made worse as a result of 20mph speed limits.

- 4.54 In addition it remains the case that a key aim of the proposals is to create streets that are more attractive for walking and cycling. The potential increase in active travel modes could lead to a reduction in car journeys, particularly those which are short and local in nature, which are the most polluting.

#### **Impact on Journey Times/Increased Congestion**

- 4.55 15 objections were made on the grounds that the scheme would cause increased congestion with 5 stating there would be increased journey times and a negative impact on bus journey times.
- 4.56 This issue has been addressed in detail in Background Document 6: Paragraphs 4.15 – 4.21. It should also be noted that Brighton and Hove Bus and Coach Company have supported the Phase 2 proposals.

#### **Legality and enforceability of the 20mph limit**

- 4.57 11 objections were made on the basis that the new limit has been or would be unenforceable/unenforced and that drivers were not and would not in the future comply with it. In addition 2 of those who expressed support for the proposals indicated that enforcement would be required or was something they were concerned about.
- 4.58 Under Section 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, Local Authorities have the power to set speed limits on their roads, including limits of 20mph. Where such limits are signed and have been made under the correct Speed Limit Orders, they are legal and they are enforceable.
- 4.59 Guidance from the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) states clearly that “Enforcement will be considered in all clearly posted limits”,
- 4.60 Officers from the Road Safety Team have undertaken joint speed monitoring interventions with local police officers and further activities are currently being planned for the coming months.
- 4.61 In order to educate drivers in the city of the legality of the limit, a communications programme will undertaken, in partnership with Sussex Police and the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership across the city to ensure that this misconception/ misunderstanding is addressed. It is expected that this will begin in the Spring.
- 4.62 Monitoring from the first months of the Phase 1 20mph limit shows that driver speeds decreased on 74% of roads and of those roads that had seen an increase a number of those maintained average speeds below 20mph. Whilst it is accepted that these results are interim only at this stage, they do provide encouraging signs that drivers in the city are, in the main, reducing their speeds in line with the lower limits.

- 4.63 Council Officers will continue to monitor compliance with the 20mph limits wherever they are introduced. Evidence will be used to identify areas of non compliance and where necessary further interventions will be considered to assist drivers with compliance. Whilst it is the aim of this programme that through driver education and well implemented limits that compliance with the lower limit can be achieved without the “stick” of enforcement, enforcement remains an available tool to be used in the city.
- 4.64 Officers and Councillor Davey have met with Senior Sussex Police Roads Policing Unit officers to discuss this issue and continue to work in partnership to ensure that all avenues of speed management are available within the city, this includes but is not limited to education and enforcement.

#### **Waste of Money**

- 4.65 26 objections stated the opinion that the programme represented a waste money and that funds would be better spent elsewhere.
- 4.66 The funding for the 20mph programme is capital funding allocated via the Department for Transport Local Transport Plan and cannot be used for revenue expenses such as social services or refuse collection as was proposed by a number of objectors.
- 4.67 Officers continue to consider that the proposals are cost effective and are significantly less expensive than the implementation of more geographically limited 20mph zones. The Department for Transport provides financial estimates of the average value of the prevention of reported road casualties and collisions. The average value of collision saving to society of just one collision is over 71k and it is at 50k on average per casualty ( rising to almost 1.7 million for a fatal casualty), bearing this in mind it is considered that the casualty saving potential of 20mph limits more than justifies the relatively small expense of the programme.
- 4.68 It should also be noted that money spent under the 20mph programme on investigative and monitoring stages is providing data that is being used not just for this programme but by a wide range of services within the Council through adopting the philosophy of “Collect Once – Use Many.”

#### **Lack of mandate/Majority do not want 20mph limits**

- 4.69 9 respondents objected claiming that they did not vote for lower limits, that the consultation had resulted in the majority rejecting 20mph and that they were unaware of anyone who supported it.
- 4.70 The report on the consultation results presented to and debated by the ETS Committee in December 2013 clearly showed that lower limits have been advertised where they were supported by local residents and were not progressed where a majority were evidenced to be opposed (for example in the Goldstone Valley and Westdene Areas of the city). The consultation did however show that whilst there was a significant amount of support for 20mph limits, it also highlighted the fact that some people are strongly opposed to the scheme and the principles that underlie it.

#### **Negative Impact on local business**

- 4.71 9 objections stated or implied that the scheme would have a negative economic impact on the area and the city as a whole, particularly with regards to attracting tourism.
- 4.72 There remains, as reported in Background Document 6, paragraph 4.45, no evidence that this would be the case. In contrast there is a growing evidence base that shows that creating attractive, safer environments for those who wish to walk can attract visitors to an area. For example improvements in Coventry City Centre which included 20mph speed limits saw a 25 percent increase in Saturday footfall and in London research has shown that those travelling on foot to local town centres spend 147 more per month than those travelling by car. Tourists to the city are often unfamiliar with road layouts and the direction of travel of traffic. As such they are potentially more vulnerable and could benefit from the improved safety of slower road speeds.

### **Signage and Road Markings**

- 4.73 3 objections were the result of respondents not wishing to see excessive signage and road markings on their streets.
- 4.74 The Council is bound by the guidance set out by the Department for Transport, Traffic Signs and Regulations General Directions, which sets out where and what type of signage is required on the highway. Signage of any new speed limit is important so that drivers and other road users have the information they need to travel safely and within the law.
- 4.75 As part of the implementation of Phase 2, just as was undertaken in Phase 1, a de-cluttering exercise will accompany the implementation so that any redundant signage is removed at the same time.
- 4.76 In addition, and in direct response to requests that were made during the public consultation, a number of smaller roads and cul de sacs, particularly along the seafront were removed from the orders as it was considered that signage would be neither necessary nor wanted at those locations. It may be that some additional, similar roads need to be considered and officers will liaise closely with local residents where this issue has been highlighted (for example Belgrave Place was mentioned by 1 respondent)
- 4.77 Wherever possible, and within the required regulations, signage for the scheme will be sympathetic to the area but it must be implemented correctly to ensure that the speed limit can be self enforcing. The approach that officers have adopted to signage has been developed with and is supported by Sussex Police.

### **Error in the orders – Cope Hill**

- 4.78 1 resident of Cope Hill (Westdene) objected to the fact that his road had been named in the list of streets advertised under Brighton & Hove (Phase 2, Area 3) (20mph Speed Limit) Order 20\*\* (TRO-3c-2014)
- 4.24 Cope Hill should not have been listed in the draft orders. It was shown in the plans accompanying the orders as retaining its existing limits. It is, therefore, recommended that this administrative error be corrected by removing it from the Orders before they are sealed.

## **5. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 5.1 It is an option to retain existing limits on Surrenden Road, Preston Drove and Stanford Avenue. To do so however would not only be contrary to the expressed wishes of local residents and of local ward Councillors, it would also add significant costs to the implementation of the scheme caused by increased signage costs. For this reason it is recommended that the Committee accept the initial officer recommendations for these roads, made again in this report, and approve the advertisement of formal Speed Limit Orders for these roads.

## **6. CONCLUSION**

- 6.1 The majority of those who responded to the Phase 2 Speed Limit Orders supported the introduction of 20mph limits in this area with the majority of objections relating to the exclusion, rather than the inclusion, of specific roads.
- 6.2 Strong public opinion exists amongst residents of the Preston area for speed limits on Surrenden Road, Preston Drove and Stanford Avenue to be reduced to 20mph. 20mph limits on these roads are not opposed by Brighton and Hove Bus and Coach Company.
- 6.3 Should approval be given to advertise the additional Speed Limit Orders requested in recommendations 2.1 to 2.5, no final decision on these roads will be made until the responses to the orders have been reviewed and reported back to the Environment, Transport and Sustainability Committee. It is expected that this could happen in April 2014.
- 6.4 The benefits of 20mph speed limits continue to be recognised nationally and internationally and ongoing interim monitoring of the Phase 1 area of Central Brighton & Hove continues to indicate that these benefits are starting to be realised in the city after 8 months. There remains, however, a continued need for the investigation, monitoring and evaluation of speed limits across the city.
- 6.5 The next steps, subject to the approval of this reports' recommendations are proposed to be:
- February 2014: Complete Street Assessments of Phase 3 Areas
  - March 2014: Advertisement of remaining Phase 2 Speed Limit Orders
  - March 2014: Commence implementation of Phase 2 Areas
  - March 2014: Traffic Surveys to establish existing speeds in Phase 3 areas
  - April 2014: Report to Committee on SLO objections
  - April 2014: Develop consultation proposals for Phase 3 Area
  - April 2014: undertake first year monitoring of Phase 1 area
  - Spring/Summer 2014: Public consultation on Phase 3 Areas
  - November 2014: Report to Committee on First Year results of Phase 1 and present results of Phase 3 Consultation

## 7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

### Financial Implications:

- 7.1 Capital: The sum of £0.350million has been allocated for the introduction of 20mph speed reductions in the city, as part of the Local Transport Plan Capital Budget for 2013-14.
- 7.2 Ongoing maintenance of the scheme will be funded from within existing Transport budgets.

*Finance Officer Consulted: Jeff Coates*

*Date: 21/02/2014*

### Legal Implications:

- 7.3 As stated in the body of the report, section 84 of Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 allows traffic authorities to set speed limits. The Council's powers and duties under the Act must be exercised to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of all types of traffic including cyclists and pedestrians. As far as is practicable, the Council should have regard to any implications in relation to: access to premises; the effect on amenities; the Council's air quality strategy; facilitating the passage of public services vehicles; securing the safety and convenience of users; any other matters that appear relevant to the Council.
- 7.4 The Council has to follow the rules on consultation set out by the government and the courts. The Council must ensure that the consultation process is carried out at a time when proposals are still at their formative stage, that sufficient reasons and adequate time must be given to allow intelligent consideration and responses and that results are properly taken into account in finalising the proposals.
- 7.5 After the proposals are formally advertised, the Council can, in the light of objections and other representations received, decide to re-consult either widely or specifically when it believes that it would be appropriate before deciding the final composition of any associated orders. Where there are unresolved objections to the Speed Limit Orders, then the matter is required to return to Environment, Transport & Sustainability Committee for a decision.

*Lawyer Consulted:*

*Name Hilary Woodward*

*Date: 21/2/14*

### Equalities Implications:

- 7.6 The scheme should improve conditions for vulnerable road users and has the potential to ease community severance by aiding the development of healthy and sustainable places and communities. In reducing the perception of road danger the scheme should enable children, young people and adults to make more and better use of their local streets.

### Sustainability Implications:

- 7.7 The proposed scheme should assist the Council in encouraging more sustainable transport use such as walking and cycling by reducing vehicle

speeds and improving safety and the perception that the streets are safer and more user friendly. Any modal shift to more sustainable transport achieved as a result of the wider implementation of 20mph speed limits will also assist in improving air quality and reducing carbon emissions contributing to the Council's 'One Planet Living' programme.

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

### **Appendices:**

1. Summary of submissions made
2. Ruling from the Advertising Standard Authority regards local 20mph Advertisements

### **Documents in Members' Rooms**

1. Copies of the submissions received in response to the Orders

### **Background Documents**

1. Environment and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee (ECSOSC) report on 20mph (2010)
2. Speed Limit Review – A & B Class Roads (September 2010)
3. Speed Limit review – 20mph Pilot Schemes (June 2011)
4. Environment and Transport Sustainability Cabinet Member Meeting – “Brighton & Hove – A 20mph City” report (May 2012)
5. Item 32 – Transport Committee Report - “Brighton & Hove – A 20mph City?” (November 2012)
6. Item 52 – Transport Committee Report - “Brighton & Hove – A 20mph City?” (January 2013)
7. Item 49 – Environment Transport and Sustainability Committee Report (December 2013)

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 1.1 There are no Crime and Disorder Implications of the report at this time.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 1.2 There is a risk that the desired outcomes of the scheme will not be fully realised. Interim monitoring, however, suggests that this risk is very low and comprehensive monitoring will continue both in the Phase 1 area and in the Phase 2 area should it progress to ensure that any issues are identified, addressed and where necessary remedial action taken.

Public Health Implications:

- 1.3 Road casualty reduction is a Public Health priority and an indicator for Domain 1 of the Public Health Outcomes Framework 2013-2016. It is anticipated that the reduction in speed limits to 20mph in residential and commercial areas will help to reduce collisions and the severity of the outcome of some collisions. It is estimated that over 95% of pedestrians involved in a collision at 20mph survive, compared with only 80% at 30mph. A review of the impact of introducing 20mph zones in London over a twenty year period (Grundy et al 2009) demonstrated a reduction in road casualties particularly amongst young children.
- 1.4 It is likely that the scheme will support people to choose more physically active lifestyles by opting to make healthier active travel choices such as walking and cycling. Physically active adults have less risk of premature death and of chronic diseases with the direct cost of physical inactivity to the NHS across the UK is estimated to be £1.06 billion. For Brighton & Hove this cost is estimated to be **£3,077,340**
- 1.5 Promoting active travel can bring important health benefits but also contributes to objectives in relation to sustainability & congestion & air pollution, especially to reduction in particulate matter. This is discussed above in paragraph 4.40.
- 1.6 NICE guidance PH 8, PH 25 and PH 31 all recommend speed restrictions and the prioritisation of pedestrian and cyclists as means to improve public health

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 1.7 The proposed scheme will assist the Council to meet its strategic objectives and will contribute to the Council's and partners' wider objectives including those set out in the Corporate Plan and the Sustainable Community Strategy.
- 1.8 Brighton and Hove Bus Company have in the past raised concerns about the impact of the 20mph speed limits in the off peak hours on a number of cross city bus routes. Research carried out whilst preparing the proposals, together with the growing evidence base of actual impacts of such schemes in other areas and

in the Phase 1 area, indicate that such concerns are unlikely to be realised as a result of the Phase 2 proposals. A significant number of roads have been excluded from the scheme, many of them requested by the bus company. In addition bus priority works being undertaken in a number of roads in the city and in the phase 2 area will provide time savings for buses that officers consider will more than compensate for any minor journey delays that could be caused by lower speed limits. Monitoring will however continue to be undertaken on this issue.