## 20 mph Call-in Scrutiny

## Call-in

The decision was inconsistent with the Budget
The alternative decision proposed by the signatories is that:
To stop the implementation of the proposed 20 mph zone, and look at restrictions for individual roads where there is a specific need

We do not believe that the $£ 300,000$ spent would provide value for money in an area where the average speed was recorded at 24 mph and the support for the scheme was somewhat underwhelming at around 3\% of residents affected. This resource should be directed to support schemes where residents have highlighted concerns and vehicles are speeding.
This does not provide value for money and is therefore inconsistent with the budget.

## Background

- 20 mph being introduced across London and other British cities - Portsmouth, Bristol, Edinburgh, Manchester
- $55 \%$ roads in inner London are 20 mph
- $35 \%$ Londoners live in a 20 mph borough
- Manifesto commitment to introduce 20 mph where residents want it
- Supported by Streets and Environment Scrutiny in September 2014


## Why 20 mph ?

- Fewer traffic accidents/less harm through lower speeds
- Pedestrian struck at $20 \mathrm{mph} 2.5 \%$ risk of fatality
- Pedestrian struck at $30 \mathrm{mph} 20 \%$ risk of fatality (ROSPA)
$-1 \%$ reduction in average speed $=6 \%$ reduction in traffic accidents (DfT)
- Better environment
- Streets form the majority of our public realm, they are not just about moving cars around
- Encourage walking and cycling - health benefits


## Evidence

Cars do slow down - Edinburgh data (2012 pilot)

- Average below 24 mph - reduction 1.9 mph
- Average above 24 mph - reduction 3.3 mph
- Roads remaining 30 mph - reduction 0.7 mph


## Evidence 2

Atkins research for DfT on impact of 20 mph speed limits

- Support for 20 mph rises after implementation - 52\% support before, 75\% after
- Majority believe it has increased safety for pedestrians and cyclists
- Increase in walking (16\%) and cycling (9\%)


## Survey response in Croydon

Do you support the proposal to lower the speed limit to 20 mph speed limit for the roads/area shown in the plan?
52.5\% yes; $46.4 \%$ no

One response per household
Question did not relate to own road - support is for an area wide scheme

## Survey response

- $50 \%$ of respondents would drive more slowly (22\% disagreed)
- 50\% said 20 mph would reduce accidents (34\% disagreed)
- $21 \%$ would walk more
- $20 \%$ would cycle more


## Speed survey

- 327 speed surveys
- 275 average speed below 24 mph
- 52 average speed above 24 mph


## Generic graph showing relationship between Speed of travel and Frequency



Speed

## Speed survey data showing the difference between 'recorded mean speed' and the actual spread of speeds recorded

| 18935 | Fri 03-Jul-15 |  |  | Site No: 18935083 |  |  | Location |  | Site 83, Bensham Lane, Croydon (TG Pole) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Period | 85\% Speed | Mean Speed | <6Mph | 6-<11 | 11-<16 | 16-<21 | 21-<26 | 26-<31 | 31-<36 | 36-<41 | 41-<46 | 46-<51 | 51-<56 | =>56 |
| 24H,0-24 | 30 | 24.9 | 6 | 53 | 252 | 743 | 2532 | 2184 | 453 | 38 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 24H, 0-24 | 30.2 | 24.9 | 4 | 35 | 203 | 746 | 1919 | 1585 | 409 | 55 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 4 |


| 18935 | Fri 05-Jun-15 |  |  | Site No: 18935017 |  |  | Location |  | Site 17, Springfield Road, Croydon (TG Pole) |  |  |  | 51-<56 | =>56 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Period | 85\% Speed | Mean Speed | <6Mph | 6-<11 | 11-<16 | 16-<21 | 21-<26 | 26-<31 | 31-<36 | 36-<41 | 41-<46 | 46-<51 |  |  |
| 24H, 0-24 | 29.3 | 21 | 3 | 58 | 98 | 85 | 133 | 110 | 32 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24H,0-24 | 29.3 | 20.2 | 13 | 64 | 86 | 59 | 90 | 102 | 28 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |


| 18935 | Wed 03-Jun-15 |  |  | Site No: 18935015 |  |  | Location |  | Site 15, Georgia road, Croydon (TG Pole OS 36) |  |  |  |  | =>56 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Period | 85\% Speed | Mean Speed | <6Mph | 6-<11 | 11-<16 | 16-<21 | 21-<26 | 26-<31 | 31-<36 | 36-<41 | 41-<46 | 46-<51 | 51-<56 |  |
| 24H, 0-24 | 28.8 | 22.2 | 0 | 15 | 67 | 222 | 173 | 90 | 32 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 24H, 0-24 | 29.8 | 22.1 | 1 | 8 | 78 | 176 | 97 | 77 | 40 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 |



## Cost

- Single road in isolation $£ 6,000$
- Cost of Area 1 £300,000
- Each area has 400 roads (2,000 total)
- Cost per road in area approach $£ 750$


## TMAC meeting

- No objectors from the area under review
- Single objector from Coulsdon


## Conclusions

- The data demonstrates that traffic is travelling well above 20 mph even though most averages are below 24 mph
- Evidence from elsewhere that 20mph speed limits reduce speed
- Implementing an area wide scheme is much more cost effective than isolated streets

This programme represents a cost effective way of reducing road casualties, improving the public realm and encouraging people to walk and cycle bringing health benefits of greater activity.

