1. **Decisions Required**

The Cabinet is requested to agree to the strategy for 20 mph zones as proposed by the Best Value Review Team and as outlined in Section 3, subject to the availability of appropriate budgets and resources.

2. **Background**

2.1 A Best Value Review (BVR) of 20 mph zones has been carried out during 2011-12. The process has followed the normal requirements of BVR to “compare”, “challenge”, “consult” and “compete”.

2.2 The final Panel Report was considered on 4th April 2012. This report summarises the findings of the review, and asks the Cabinet to endorse the strategy, as recommended by the Review Team, as detailed in section 3 of this report.

2.3 Comparisons have been made with a number of other local authorities with reputations for ‘best practice’. Consultation and comparison has taken the form of desk top studies of best practice, stakeholder workshops and latterly a public on-line survey.

2.4 Currently outcome monitoring data shows that RBG’s ‘20 zones’ compare favourably with those of other London Boroughs, showing a net 56% reduction in casualties and 68% fewer killed & serious injured.

3. **BVR Findings and Suggested Strategy**

3.1 Following the findings of the 20 mph Best Value Review Team and the outcome of consultation, the Cabinet are asked to consider the proposed strategy for 20 mph zones comprising some or all of the following measures,
with their implementation phased over the next 2 - 4 financial years and funded through the Local Implementation Plan, and, where appropriate, developer contributions:

a. The phased implementation of a “borough-wide 20 mph scheme” for all currently untreated residential roads that do not form part of the “principal” road network,

b. The continued use of self-enforcing traffic calming measures in those locations where road traffic hazards are demonstrable, either by virtue of high recorded 85th percentile traffic speeds (>30 mph) and/or significant collisions involving pedestrians and cyclists,

c. The establishment of 20 mph zones (or limits) elsewhere using signs and road markings in accordance with the revised regulations published by the DfT in October 2011, supplemented as appropriate by speed activated warning signs (Further investigation to be undertaken to determine whether these signs can record their usage thus providing automatic feedback on their effectiveness.).

d. The establishment of a borough-wide “Road Watch” scheme to encourage residents to participate in the enforcement of speed limits under the supervision of the Metropolitan Police.

4. Summary of the BVR Process

4.1 The BVR process has comprised three stakeholder workshops that were held on 3 November 2011, 12 January 2012 and 9 February 2012. Detailed reports of these meetings were subsequently considered by the BVR Panel, and the main outcomes are summarised as follows.

4.2 The first workshop was addressed by Zahur Khan of L B Islington who described Islington’s “borough-wide 20 mph scheme”. Amongst the assembled there was strong consensus that lower speeds reduce both accidents and severity, but it was recognised that traffic calming generally is not universally welcomed, and that ‘signing-only’ schemes (where appropriate) would be easier to implement.

4.3 The second workshop heard from Theresa Trussell (Kent CC) relating to the “Ashford Ring Road Shared Space Project”. It was generally agreed that shared space schemes have a role to play. However there is strong evidence that pedestrians are reluctant to share space unless traffic flows are low, and little evidence that shared space, by itself, can accomplish significant modal shift. Careful thought must be given to the kinds of streets to be treated and the restrictions on those streets. The strategy should also include the measures needed in the wider locality to accommodate (or reduce) the displaced traffic.
4.4 The second workshop was also addressed by Colin McKenzie (Metropolitan Police) on the operation of “Road Watch” community policing schemes. This initiative was well received. However it was thought necessary to establish a borough-wide pool of volunteers to target areas of need with a joined-up approach that makes use of established Council networks. Without this approach there was a high risk that more ‘articulate areas’ could dominate the agenda to the detriment of more needy areas.

4.5 The third workshop heard from Norma Fender (L B Lambeth) on “Lambeth’s Road Danger Reduction (RDR) Strategy”. This described a more holistic way to address some of the hidden factors behind casualty numbers. RDR seeks to redefine safety in terms of danger to others (“who is killing whom”) with a view to reducing the ability of “dangerous” road users to cause harm. This implies encouraging more environmentally benign modes (walking, cycling, public transport), which cause the least danger, to create a more civilised, greener and safer environment.

4.6 This was followed by an exercise to assess stakeholders’ road safety priorities. Amongst the assembled the following propositions were seen as a high priority:

- All **residential** streets in the borough should have a 20 mph speed limit (but not principal roads)
- Streets should be designed with the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport first.

5. **On Line Survey**

5.1 Towards the end of February, an on-line survey was launched to assess public attitudes to 20 mph zones. This was completed by 45 people who lived in one of the current 20 zones and 158 people who did not (or did not say). The findings are summarised in the attached Table 1.

5.2 Significant amongst these results is the larger proportion of people living in 20 zones who feel safer walking near traffic in their neighbourhoods compared with those who live elsewhere. Across all areas some 64% of respondents feel that vehicles move too quickly on their streets and 66% would prefer to live within a 20 zone. However 52% of respondents would prefer their streets not to have traffic calming as the means of enforcing vehicle speed.

5.3 Although not included in the Table 1 results, it should be noted that the online survey also elicited a petition with 44 signatures signed on behalf of 33
households of Elliscombe Road (West Charlton). The petition calls for the Council to reduce the speed limit in Elliscombe Road to 20mph, citing a pending new development and damage to vehicles caused by speeding traffic. The petition has been passed through the normal channels for actioning.

6. Changes in Legislation

6.1 In October 2011, the Government issued “special directions” relating to traffic calming and signing within 20 zones. The “new regulations” require at least one “traffic calming feature” within a 20 zone. Otherwise the Royal Borough may use “any combination” of traffic calming features, upright repeater signs or “20” roundel markings at a maximum spacing of 100 metres. But in adopting this approach, proper regard should be paid to established methods founded on sound research and tried-&-tested practice.

6.2 Work done by the Transport Research Laboratory during the 1990s found that 20 mph zones were effective in reducing speeds and collisions only when they included ‘self-enforcing’ traffic calming. By contrast ‘signed-only 20 limits’ resulted in far less speed reduction and accident savings. The Royal Borough’s own experience over the last decade is consistent with these findings. Therefore in residential streets where there are demonstrable problems of high speed (>30 mph) and/or significant collisions involving pedestrians and cycles, ‘self-enforcing’ traffic calming measures will still be needed.

6.3 Residential areas in the Royal Borough that had the worst accident records have already been treated with fully traffic calmed 20 zones, and it is becoming increasing difficult to find new areas where the potential casualty savings would justify the cost of similar treatment. By using the changes in legislation and implementing simpler ‘limits’ in areas which don’t have high accident records it should still be possible to maintain value for money and a good return on investment (although the rate of accident reduction may be reduced).

6.4 Simplified low-cost schemes, therefore, with more signing and less traffic calming could offer more cost-effective solutions for most remaining untreated areas with only moderate safety concerns. Depending on the extent of traffic calming required, typically one might expect to deliver a predominantly “signed” 20 zone for some 10% - 20% of the costs of a fully traffic calmed scheme.
7. Enforcement

7.1 In the light of BVR feedback and the experience of LB Islington, there appears to be a strong case for introducing 20 mph zones (or limits) to all residential areas of the Royal Borough that as yet remain untreated. It would first be necessary to identify the “principal” road network on which the existing speed limits should remain. Thereafter a programme of works could be brought forward for the phased implementation of a “borough-wide 20 mph scheme” predominantly with low-cost signing, but incorporating traffic calming measures where required (see 5.2).

7.2 20 zones implemented mainly with signing will have only limited “self-enforcing” properties so will require other enforcement measures. In response to Government policy, no new speed safety camera sites are being introduced across Greater London at the present time, but in any event, residential streets seldom meet the approved criteria for safety cameras. Speed warning signs (popular with Greenwich residents) can be installed as an alternative. These can be effective for limited time periods and by maintaining a stock of such devices, the Royal Borough can recycle them periodically to sites where inappropriate speeds are frequently reported.

7.3 The Police cannot be relied on to enforce in 20 zones and given the limitations of the alternatives, it would fall on the Greenwich community to take more responsibility for enforcing the signed lower speed limit. To these ends it would be beneficial to establish a borough-wide “Road Watch” scheme through which residents could engage periodically in enforcement activities under the supervision of the Metropolitan Police.

8. Financial Implications and Comments of the Director of Finance

8.1 This report lays out a strategy for the borough in relation to 20 mph Zones. Funding for the strategy is expected to be from the Local Implementation Plan and developer contributions where appropriate. Actual schemes of work and their relevant funding arrangements will be agreed separately.
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### TABLE 1: Response to 20 mph zones BVR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Agree vehicles move too quickly on their street</th>
<th>Would like street to be in 20mph zone</th>
<th>Agree traffic calming is good for slowing traffic</th>
<th>Prefer 20mph limit without traffic calming</th>
<th>Agree flashing warning signs work well</th>
<th>Feel safe walking near traffic</th>
<th>Feel safe cycling near traffic (or N/A)</th>
<th>Feel safe driving near traffic (or N/A)</th>
<th>Would like to be involved in local speed awareness measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living in 20 mph zone</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living in 20 mph (or don't know)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across All Areas</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>