

# Safe-Street Neighbourhoods: the role of lower speed limits – 2019 Update WA & NSW

Dick van den Dool<sup>1</sup>, Paul Tranter<sup>2</sup>, Adrian Boss<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Barros van den Dool Active Transport Pty Ltd, Maroubra, NSW, Australia

<sup>2</sup>School of Physical, Environmental and Mathematical Sciences, UNSW Canberra (the Australian Defence Force Academy), Canberra, ACT, Australia

<sup>3</sup>BIKEast Incorporated, Bondi Junction, NSW, Australia

## Note

This paper was first published in the Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety, Vol 28 No 3, 2017, pp55-63, under the same title. This 2019 update includes current data from both WA and NSW and was sponsored by the Department of Transport, WA.

## Key Findings

- 30 km/h speed limits on local residential streets have the potential to reduce Australian road transport casualties by 7% or \$1.6 billion every year.
- Safe-Street Neighbourhoods require strong leadership – political champions and well-trained street designers.
- A good example is the WA Safe Active Streets program, which receives bilateral political support from successive governments.
- Community fears about impacts on travel time are a political reality but technically unfounded.
- The Federal Blackspot program can be readily extended to accommodate Safe Active Street and Safe-Street Neighbourhood initiatives.

## Abstract

Neighbourhood streets play a vital role in making places liveable. Rather than seeing them as simply transport corridors for cars, they are important places for walking, cycling, social interaction and even playful exploration by local children. This paper argues that neighbourhood streets provide a valuable focus for a road safety intervention that has low cost and yet promises considerable benefits for road safety, neighbourhood amenity, public health and the community at large. While there is likely to be opposition to the introduction of lower speed limits in local neighbourhood streets, this paper provides evidence that such opposition is not justified. Lower speed limits in residential streets provide an important new strategy for achieving continued reductions in injury rates from road crashes in Australia. Current trials of 30 km/h traffic calmed Safe Active Streets in Perth are receiving general community support, as does the City-wide 30 km/h demonstration project in Yarra, VIC.

## Key Words

30 km/h speed limits, neighbourhood amenity, road safety champions.

## Introduction

The February 2014 report by the Australian Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics (BITRE, 2014) on “Road Safety: Modelling a Global Phenomenon” sounds a sombre warning. While fatality rates have trended down, injury rates show a recent independent upward movement. Moreover, the report warns that as the main measures that have been responsible for downward movements begin to reach maximum effect, the tendency will be for flat to rising levels of death and injury, unless previous measures are reinforced and/or new road safety measures are brought into play.

In addition to the worrying general road safety trends, the issues for vulnerable road users are compounded, as discussed in the recent review of the National Road Safety Strategy (Austroads, 2015):

- *“The Safe System philosophy for vulnerable road users is not as well developed as for vehicle occupants. This has been found to be true nationally and internationally, with even leading countries such as Sweden increasing their focus on vulnerable road users. The main finding of the recent review of road safety from the International Transport Forum was that vulnerable road users are receiving smaller benefits from recent road safety improvements than vehicle occupants.”*



Original research has delved further into these phenomena, with a focus on pedestrian safety, sourcing data from 6 jurisdictions, including NSW, Australia, The Netherlands, Denmark, the United Kingdom and the United States (van den Dool & Job, 2014). The research interrogates: crash trends from 1993 to 2012; “all crashes” vs “pedestrian crashes”; casualty numbers vs crash rates per capita vs indexed patterns; and the proportion of pedestrian casualties.

The findings indicate that pedestrian crash numbers in NSW have declined dramatically over the past decade, when compared to "all" crashes. Since 2006 pedestrian crashes at a population level have fallen below the OECD average for 2009. There appears to be a strong correlation with the expanded introduction of 40km/h High Pedestrian Activity Areas, 40km/h School Zones and related engineering, enforcement and educational measures.

However, as with the BITRE report, trends in pedestrian crashes are flattening and remain well above the rates in Denmark and The Netherlands. Fatality and injury patterns in the UK are generally ahead of world trends, but not so where pedestrians are concerned. Tolley (2014) explains that while the UK is increasingly expanding its network of slow speed urban environments, to date 20mph zones are limited to about 20% of the urban residential precincts. In contrast, Dutch 30km/h precincts reportedly cover about 80% of urban residential precincts, with the specific and successful purpose to reduce the road toll.


### **30km/h, 40km/h and 50 km/h speed limits**

Over a period of 10 years from about 1995 to 2005 Australian Governments gradually reduced the general urban limit from 60km/h to 50km/h. However, Australian Governments did not simultaneously change the speed limit in 40km/h zones to 30km/h. The road safety benefits of such a change are well-known and widely documented by Austroads and various National, State and Territory transport agencies, as shown for example in Figure 1. The risk of a pedestrian fatality at 40km/h is 25% compared to 10% at 30km/h or more than twice as high, while the risk at 50km/h is 5 times that at 30km/h (Austroads, 2012; Transport for NSW, 2014).



**Figure 1. Probability of pedestrian fatality by motor vehicle speed as reported by Austroads (2012) and Transport for NSW (2014)**

More recent research in New Zealand (Hughes, 2014) further emphasises the problem (Figure 2), showing that although the fatality rate may be low at speeds of 40 km/h, there are serious concerns about severe injury risk for pedestrians at speeds of 40km/h and above.



**Figure 2. Probability of pedestrian fatality by motor vehicle speed as reported by the NZ Transport Agency (Hughes, 2014)**

There is no debate about the fact that speed increases beyond 30 km/h significantly increase the risk of death or serious injury. The pedestrian fatality risk is a function of the impact speed “with the fatality risk at 50 km/h being more than twice as high as the risk at 40 km/h and more than five times higher than the risk at 30 km/h” (Rosen & Sander, 2009).

As well as a lower risk of fatality or injury at lower speeds, the likelihood of avoiding any collision is much greater at lower speeds due to the much lower stopping distances at 30 km/h compared with 50 km/h. Most motorists have little appreciation of the huge increase in risk associated with even slight increases in driving speed. A 30 km/h speed compared with 50 km/h could mean the difference between a person not being struck by a car at 30 km/h and being killed or seriously injured at 50 km/h (Svenson, et al, 2012):

- *“We assume a reaction time of 1 s and at a speed of 30 km/h a car will travel 8.33 m (30 000/3600) during that time before the brakes start to apply. If the speed is 50 km/h the corresponding distance is 13.89 m. This is a little longer than the total stopping distance from 30 km/h (12.75 m). This means that a driver who could stop from 30 km/h in front of an obstacle would hit that obstacle at a speed of 50 km/h if she drove at 50 km/h under the same conditions”.*

This study also identified that drivers were “overly optimistic” about their ability to stop quickly, and showed little understanding of the impact of higher speeds on their stopping ability. The authors suggested that this was an important consideration in attitudes to speed limits. The researchers *“asked participants to imagine that they themselves had driven a car outside a school at a speed of 30 km/h when a child suddenly had rushed into the street. From this speed it was possible to stop the car just in front of the child after braking as quickly and forcefully as possible. We then asked the participants to imagine that they drove the same street at a higher speed of 50 km/h and the child appeared at the same place as before. At what speed would the car hit the child after braking in the same way as before? ... the judged speeds of collision were always underestimated”.*

The difference in impact speed between cars travelling at 40 km/h compared to 30 km/h is also significant. Corben, D’Elia and Healy (2006) calculated stopping distances for a range of initial travel speeds, assuming a driver perception-reaction time of 1.2 seconds and a coefficient of friction of 0.7, which they claim are typical values for the analysis of stopping distances. A driver who could stop from 30 km/h in front of an obstacle would hit that obstacle at a speed of approximately 36 km/h if driving at 40 km/h. On the basis of the evidence in Figure 2, this would mean the difference between no impact and very likely serious injury if the obstacle was a pedestrian.

Streets that have cars travelling slowly (at 30 km/h or less) “feel” safer to pedestrians and cyclists. This change in the psychological feel of streets leads to a greater use of the streets by pedestrians, which enhances the levels of connection between people and further reinforces the view that streets are not just for cars, and that drivers have a responsibility to take care around vulnerable road users. A recent Japanese study found that drivers respected the rights of vulnerable users: “a majority of respondents agreed that motorists should give priority to pedestrians/cyclists anywhere they are encountered on 30 km/h residential streets” (Dinh and Kubota, 2013, 35). In a landmark case before the Supreme Court of Queensland (2012) on the responsibility of drivers and child pedestrians, Judge McMeekin ruled:

- *“Hence, in pedestrian cases, typically a heavier share of responsibility falls on the motorist even if the degrees of departure from the standard of reasonable care be more or less equal.”*

There is an important distinction between areas that have lower speed limits (30 km/h or 20 mph) only (and few physical changes to the streets apart from line marking) and speed restriction zones, which have both lower speed limits as well as significant physical changes to the streetscape. These changes include road engineering interventions such as chicanes, vertical deflections (speed humps) and other alterations to physically slow traffic.

Low speed limits are much cheaper to implement, although they typically lead to smaller reductions in average speed (Calvert, 2016, 56). However, even though the reductions in speed may be smaller, low speed limits can be implemented over much larger areas for the same cost as a small area as a speed restriction zone. This means that a much larger population is affected and “small

improvements to many people add up to a total of much more than large improvements for a few” (King and Semlyen, 2016, 66). Even reducing average speed by 1-2mph can have a significant effect with a wide area. “Each 1mph less is 5- 6% fewer casualties. That 1-2mph reduction over the network adds up to much more benefit to more residents than a large reduction on a few streets in a zone” (King and Semlyen, 2016, 66). Thus, while physical low speed zones may be ideal if costs were ignored, for the same cost 50 times more people could be included in area-wide 30 km/h speed limits with line markings than could be included in physical speed zones.

King and Semlyn (2016, 66) further note that isolated and small area physically calmed low speed zones may have the effect of encouraging drivers to 'speed up' as they leave the zone. In contrast, larger areas with 30 km/h speed limits encourage a mindset among drivers that low speeds are appropriate in 'all' neighbourhood streets. Private observations by the authors confirm such patterns may also be true for small 10km/h Shared Zones.

Grundy et al (2009) found that the greatest reduction in road casualties from the introduction of 20 mph zones was amongst young children. The zones were particularly effective in reducing the severity of injury, as well as the total number of collisions. An important point here is that this study also found that there was little, if any, collision migration to surrounding roads after the introduction of these zones in London.

## The Challenge

Changing speed limits in residential streets to 30 km/h has met with considerable opposition from the community at large, not just in Australia but overseas. When such limits were introduced in 1992 across the entire city of Graz, Austria, the majority of residents were not in support of them (Heinrich, 2013):

- *“When the discussion around speed reduction started in 1992, the approval for lower speeds was around 44%, but by 1995 this had nearly doubled to 82%”.*

In Graz, public support for the lower speed limits rapidly grew to a level where even the majority of motorists were supportive— $\frac{2}{3}$  of car drivers were supportive of the lower speed limits in 1994, compared with  $\frac{1}{3}$  in 1992 when the limits were introduced (Hoenig, 2000).


In terms of road safety, Graz project resulted in a 12% reduction of accidents with injury, 24% reduction in serious injury, 17% reduction in pedestrian injury and a 14% reduction in injury to car users. Despite only a 4% reduction in cyclist injuries, 83% of cyclists strongly supported the reduced speed limit. General acceptance soon became so high that in July 1994, the scheme was made permanent.

In 2011, the South Australian Government engaged the services of world-renowned road safety expert Fred Wegman as part of its “Thinker in Residence” program. In the lead up to his engagement, Wegman conducted a media interview (Adelaide Advertiser, 2010), which brought out (South) Australian fears of a Nanny State with the discussion of extensive 30km/h zones in urban residential areas. These same fears were evident in the mid-1990s, when Australia transitioned from a 60km/h urban limit to the now widely applauded road safety success of the 50km/h urban limit (van den Dool, 1992). The important lessons are:

- Yes, careful consideration is required with good and detailed campaigns to inform communities and opinion leaders
- Yes, it is necessary to have strong leadership – a political champion
- Yes, strong improvements are expected in urban road safety.

In NSW, for example, the data shows (Transport for NSW, 2017; RMS, 2019):


- Two thirds of all casualty crashes occur in urban areas
- In urban areas, more than two thirds of casualty crashes occur on local and collector streets with 50-60km/h speed limits
- 50 and 60 km/h streets have shown a 19% reduction in casualty crashes over the 21 year period from 1998 (almost no 50km/h zones) to 2017 (extended implementation of 50km/h urban limit, Figure 3), compared to a 20% casualty crash **increase** on 70-110km/h roads and an overall casualty crash reduction of 7%.



**Figure 3. NSW casualty crashes reduced dropped by 19% following introduction of the 50km/h Urban Speed Limit (Data Source: Transport for NSW, 2017; RMS, 2019)**

Similarly, in WA, the data shows (Main Roads WA, 2019):

- More than 80% of all casualty crashes occur in urban areas
- In urban areas, 70% of casualty crashes occur on local and collector streets with 50-60km/h speed limits
- The 50 km/h speed limit was introduced in WA in December 2001, with compliance increasing over a number of years (Main Roads WA, 2003)
- 50 and 60 km/h streets have shown a 55% reduction in casualty crashes over the 21 year period from 1998 to 2018 (Figure 4), compared to a 19% casualty crash reduction on 70-110km/h roads and an overall casualty crash reduction of 45%.



**Figure 4. WA casualty crashes reduced dropped by 55% following introduction of the 50km/h Urban Speed Limit (Data Source: Main Roads, 2019)**

One argument used to oppose lower speed limits is that they will impose time costs on motorists. Table 1 shows that the generic impact of introducing 30km/h in urban residential streets is almost negligible in terms of travel time, i.e. 48 seconds for a 27 minute trip, or less than 3%. There is some evidence that real travel speeds on local streets are well below the nominal 50km/h limit, which reduces the impact on travel times. The travel time and distance data are taken directly from the NSW Bureau of Transport Statistics (2013), including an average journey to work of 14km, which takes 26min. For the purposes of this research, it is assumed that no one lives and works further than 500m from the nearest 50km/h or 60km/h road. This would require the development of a good road hierarchy for each urban residential precinct that sets speed limits in accordance with desired outcomes, i.e. a relatively simple design parameter.

Similarly, in WA the impact of a 30km/h limit in residential neighbourhood street is negligible, with a mere 1.4km/h drop in the average speed of the journey to work, using 2016 WA travel time data (Department of Transport WA, 2019a, Table 2).

**Table 1. Travel Time Implications of 30km/h in urban residential streets, generically in the Sydney Metropolitan Area**


	Distance (km)	Time 50km/h (min)	Time 30 km/h (min)	Difference (min)	Diff (seconds)
<b>Travel Time</b>					
<b>Home to main road</b>	0.5	0.6	1.0	0.4	24
<b>Main road</b>	13.0	24.8	24.8	0	0
<b>Work to main road</b>	0.5	0.6	1.0	0.4	24
<b>Total</b>	14.0	26.0	26.8	0.8	48
<b>Average Speed</b>		32km/h	31km/h		-1.0km/h

**Table 2. Travel Time Implications of 30km/h in urban residential streets, generically in the Perth Metropolitan Area**


	Distance (km)	Time 50km/h (min)	Time 30 km/h (min)	Difference (min)	Diff (seconds)
<b>Travel Time</b>					
<b>Home to main road</b>	0.5	0.6	1.0	0.4	24
<b>Main road</b>	16.0	22.7	22.7	0	0
<b>Work to main road</b>	0.5	0.6	1.0	0.4	24
<b>Total</b>	17.0	23.9	24.7	0.8	48
<b>Average Speed</b>		43km/h	41km/h	-1.4km/h	

These arguments about the negligible impact of 30 km/h speed limits on travel time are supported by previous research. Indeed, Wallén Warner and Åberg (2008) argue that drivers’ time saving beliefs regarding speeding should be paid more attention: most drivers believed that time could be saved by speeding, despite strong evidence that travel time is often unchanged, or even reduced if the speed limit is observed.

Figure 5 and Figure 6 show two examples of how such a system could theoretically be achieved in a residential precinct near Maroubra Junction in Sydney’s Eastern Suburbs and in the Scarborough Beach area in Perth. Clearly, there is a need for further local research and consultation before such schemes could be implemented.



**Figure 5. Applied example of 30km/h in a residential precinct near Maroubra Junction, NSW (source: Google Earth)**



**Figure 6. Applied example of 30km/h in a residential precinct near Scarborough Beach, WA (source: Google Earth)**

## The Speed Paradox

Reducing speed limits to 30 km/h in residential streets may not lead to longer trip times. Indeed, it may even lead to a reduction in time pressure. Garrard (2008) explains: *“Evidence from studies in several countries indicates that the main (publicly articulated) reasons for opposing reduced speed limits in urban areas; namely, increased travel time and costs, are substantially overstated. Small travel time benefits associated with higher speed limits (an average of 9 seconds/km in one study) come at substantial cost in terms of the health and wellbeing of individuals and communities”*. In Bristol (Ingamells & Raffle, 2012), signs-only 20 mph pilots resulted in increased walking and cycling, reduced road speeds, and no impact on journey times or bus reliability.

In addition to the trivial loss of time in actual trips made by car drivers in areas with low speed limits, there is also evidence (Tranter 2010, 2012) that attempts to save time through increasing trip speeds is a futile exercise. For the majority of motorists, the main time demand of driving is not the time spent in cars, it is the time spent earning the money to pay for the multitude of costs associated with motor vehicle use. When these costs are considered, the “effective speed” of any mode of transport can be calculated. This shows that cycling is effectively faster than cars in most urban areas (Tranter, 2012).

Not only do cars not provide the time savings many people believe they do, when cars become the dominant mode of transport, local shops, schools and services are more likely to be closed, necessitating longer distances to be driven. Evidence of this can be found in Melbourne, where the number of land uses within 800 metres of people’s homes has fallen dramatically in the last 50 years, as local shops, schools and services such as post offices are closed. The longer distances to schools (along with other factors) has produced a decline in the proportion of children allowed to walk or cycle to school (Van Der Ploeg, et al, 2008). This means that parents are forced to spend increasing amounts of time transporting and supervising children (Future Foundation, 2006). Decreasing residential speed limits may well mean that residents have less time demands than in areas where speed limits are higher.

## The Benefits

Based on the Dutch experience (SWOV, 2006, 2010), the road safety benefits of widespread introduction of 30km/h in urban residential streets can be readily established. Table 3 shows a worked example for 50km/h streets in NSW and WA, with the potential to reduce the total of 6,922 casualty crashes by some 3,292 casualty crashes with a community benefit of \$712 million.

**Table 3. The small price of 48 seconds travel time could save 6 lives and over 3,200 injuries in NSW+WA alone**

	Annual Average Number of Crashes in NSW + WA <sup>1)</sup>	Crash Reduction <sup>2)</sup>	Savings in Crashes at 80% Conversion <sup>2)</sup>	Cost per Crash <sup>3)</sup>	Savings in Crash Costs at 80% conversion
<b>Fatal crash</b>	77	10%	6	\$7,653,597	\$47 million
<b>Serious injury crash</b>	1,997	60%	959	\$497,393	\$477 million
<b>Moderate injury crash</b>	3,181	60%	1,527	\$83,423	\$127 million
<b>Minor/Other injury crash</b>	1,668	60%	800	\$76,668	\$61 million
<b>Total</b>	6,922		3,292		\$712 million

*Notes*  
 1 – Annual average for NSW (2015-2017, for WA (2016-2018)  
 2 – SWOV (2006, 2010)  
 3 – Transport for NSW (2018)

On a nation-wide level, the benefits amount to 7% of the Australian road toll:

- \$22 billion annual national casualty crash cost
- NSW + WA ± 42% of all crashes
- NSW + WA crash cost saving = \$0.7 billion
- Potential national saving = \$1.6 billion
- 7% of national crash cost

It is important to note that the majority of the benefit arises from reduction in injuries. In this context, it is pertinent to reconsider the sombre warning by BITRE (2014) about increasing injury rates and the inability of historic road safety measures to continue into the future.

Many city governments around the world have already discovered that low speed environments have more than just road safety benefits. Low speed environments create more liveable cities, facilitate low crime levels, increase levels of physical activity, increase social connectedness, promote healthier citizens, increase access to local goods and services and lower levels of pollution.

People living in areas with low volumes of motorised traffic experience much higher levels of interaction and friendliness with their neighbours (Appleyard & Lintell, 1972). Children have more local playmates when traffic speeds and volumes are lower. A lack of social connection is now being recognised as a key determinant of poor health, both mental and physical (Berkman & Syme, 1979; Cornwell & Waite, 2009). 30 km/h zones lead to less fuel use and greenhouse gas emissions, and reduced air and noise pollution (Garrard, 2008). “German 30km/h zones led to car drivers changing gear 12% less often, braking 14% less often and using 12% less fuel” (European

Federation of Road Traffic Victims, 2013). Compared to 50 km/h, 30 km/h reduces traffic noise by 3 decibels. This also supports greater social connection as people can converse more easily, as well as sleep more easily.

When streets are seen as being safer for children, parents are more likely to allow them to walk and cycle to school and to other places. Freedom to independently explore local neighbourhoods and to partake in outdoor play is vital for children's emotional, social and cognitive development (Tranter & Sharpe, 2012). Higher levels of children's independent mobility also give parents more freedom and time to spend on activities other than driving. Parents in Australia today spend twice the time transporting and supervising children than a generation ago, and children's independent travel has been declining significantly over the last few decades (Freeman & Tranter, 2011). Reducing speed limits to 30 km/h would increase the likelihood that children are given licences to walk to school alone or cycle around their neighbourhoods. "When local authorities introduce speed restrictions within residential areas it may worth promoting the benefits for children, in particular, to gain support throughout the community" (Carver, 2013).

*"Fewer road victims frees up facilities for other health needs. Fewer work days are lost. Widow, disability benefit and care savings. Active travel cuts obesity and heart disease. Inequalities reduce as less children die. Quality of life rises"* (European Federation of Road Traffic Victims, 2013).

## Implementation

Australia-wide road transport agencies have adopted policies (RTA, 2011) requiring that slower speed environments are "self-enforcing". In other words, there is a need for physical measures such as traffic calming, main street programs and local area traffic management. Research suggests that drivers themselves identify "re-designing streets to make them inherently calmer" and implementing traffic calming as the most effective anti-speeding strategies to support lower speed limits (Dinh & Kubota, 2013; Stradling et al, 2003). Experience in The Netherlands (SWOV, 2006) has indicated "sparse" implementation of such measures can be effective with measures focussed on the most important bottlenecks and dangerous locations such as the entry points to residential precinct and at intersections:

- *"As regards the quality of 30 km/h zones, the road authorities themselves indicate that about two-thirds have been implemented at low-cost, and one-third at an optimum sustainably safety level. Low-cost solutions were not originally part of the Sustainable Safety vision, but they have been permitted at an early stage to allow for large scale construction of 30 km/h zones within the available budget. Priority was also given to the most important bottlenecks and dangerous locations. It was assumed, however, that low-cost construction would be followed by sustainably safe construction at an optimum level. It is intended that the next phase of Sustainable Safety should continue with the construction and adaptation of 30 km/h zones."*

Research for the Department of Transport and Main Roads Queensland (2015) builds on Dutch research indicating roundabouts on local street intersections can be an effective measure to facilitate "sparse" implementation of traffic calming measures. The research indicates that traditional Australian "tangential" designs appear to be too generous, allowing general traffic to flow through the roundabout at relatively high speeds which are incompatible with pedestrian and bicycle movements. Recent trials in South Australia using tightly designed "radial" roundabouts appear to be effective in reducing speeds (Figure 7).



**Figure 7. Tangential roundabout redesigned to radial, Beulah Road, Norwood, SA (source: GTA Consultants)**

Another example is the WA program on Safe Active Streets (Department of Transport WA, 2017, Figure 8). In essence, Safe Active Streets are local residential streets with traditional traffic calming and an active transport overlay, but there is more to it. Key cycling elements include:

- A clearly, self-explaining, legible route (unlike main roads which continue for long distances, Safe Active Streets typically runs along a series of inter-connected local streets and intersections, which do not naturally provide route continuity)
- Direct connectivity with other elements of the cycle network, often across council boundaries, for access to shops, school, employment and services
- Priority over cross streets – bikes are a vehicle of momentum and stop-start conditions require large amounts of energy
- Excellent crossing facilities at main roads for safety and comfort
- Design speeds (and ideally speed limits) of 30km/h which is slower than the traditional 40km/h for traffic calming in Australia – this is essential for achieving the required safety outcomes.



**Figure 8. Opening of the Safe Active Street along Shakespeare Street, Mount Hawthorn, WA (source: GTA Consultants)**

The Bicycle User Group for Sydney’s Eastern Suburbs, BIKEast, has developed a similar initiative on Safe-Street Neighbourhoods (Boss, 2016), which has been endorsed by its state-wide parent organisation, Bicycle NSW. The focus is on changing neighbourhood streets in ways that slow traffic and complements cycling networks under local bike plans and strategies. It is an urban design-based approach to foster redesign of streets, help tame the behaviour of motorists and riders and make local streets safe for everyone to use and enjoy and will also be good for local businesses and service providers. Its aims and objectives are:

- Make neighbourhood streets safe for all to use and enjoy.
- Design or re-design local neighbourhood streets to:
  - make all vulnerable users safe by introducing 30km/h speed zoning
  - primarily serve residential needs while maintaining essential vehicular access
  - further improve amenity through adaptations that serve people's use and enjoyment
  - make every street a cycle street for a connected neighbourhood and city.

## Political Leadership

Wegman (2012) concludes there is a need for strong, *libertarian paternalistic* political leadership – a champion who really makes a difference:

- *“I conclude a need for government interventions in road safety, not only because ‘harm to others’ is involved, but also because personal choices require some sort of paternalistic guidance.”*
- *“So far, we have introduced ‘the government’ as a single entity. As we all know, this is not the case. It is important to make a distinction between elected officials, politicians, and the bureaucracy. It is worthwhile paying specific attention to elected officials, because they have to play an important leadership role. It is not easy to see how progress can be made without*

*giving a key role to politicians. Sometimes we call them ‘champions’; politicians who really make a difference.”*

The analysis of Wegman’s legacy conducted for Walk21 (Dool & Job, 2014), further confirms the need for a champion. This requirement for political leadership is also emphasised in the current review of the National Road Safety Strategy (Austroads, 2015):

- *“Many stakeholders thought that the accountability for road safety is unclear and does not assist the leadership task. Improvement in institutional structures, capacities and delivery arrangements at a national level were identified as part of the “First Steps” agenda. Governance arrangements for road safety under the Transport and Infrastructure Council have been modified in the last two years to improve national oversight and coordination of the NRSS and provision of policy advice to Commonwealth, state and territory governments.”*

## **Conclusion**

While recent research suggests that even 30 km/h might be too high in residential streets if the aim is to eliminate severe injury (Kroyer, 2015), the evidence for the effectiveness of 30 km/h speed limits compared with 40 or 50 km/h limits is strong. However, this does not automatically mean that policy changes toward introducing lower speed limits will occur. The critical question is: are politicians willing to show the courage to implement something that some groups will at first likely not support. As Enrique Penalosa explains:

- *“New visions rarely have majority support. You have to take a risk to implement them.”*

Vested interests for maintaining the dominance of the car may argue that the densities of Australian cities are too low, or that the lower speed limits will lead to a loss of time. Neither of these arguments withstands close scrutiny. This paper identifies the need for a cultural shift in the attitudes toward speed in residential areas. Part of this cultural shift involves an understanding of the speed paradox – speed does not always save us time.

## **Recommendations**

Recognising the challenges ahead for road safety policy in Australia, particularly for vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, cyclists and pedestrians, the authors make the following recommendations:

- 1) Appoint and adequately resource political champions who can lead the community debate regarding Safe-Street Neighbourhoods at both a National and State level.
- 2) Engage with industry to develop a training program on the design of Safe-Street Neighbourhoods and Safe Active Streets.
- 3) Confirm that the NSW and WA crash patterns (as presented here) are mimicked in the other Australian jurisdictions.
- 4) With a view to saving an estimated \$1.6 billion annually (7%) in casualty crash costs in Australia, extend the Federal Blackspot Funding Program to:
  - develop a road hierarchy for all urban residential areas whereby no one lives further than about 500m from a road with a speed limit of 50km/h or more
  - change existing 40km/h zones to 30km/h
  - implement “sparse” extension of 30km/h to 50% of local streets, using “radial” roundabouts and entry thresholds, and treating known crash spots
  - over time:

- more intense treatment in accordance with “safe system” or “sustainable safety” principles
- expand 30km/h to 100% of local neighbourhood streets.
- Examples of effective and widely supported programs include the Safe Active Streets program in Western Australia and the BIKEast Safe-Street Neighbourhoods initiative.

## References

- Adelaide Advertiser (2010). *Expert wants 30km/h limit to reduce road toll*. On-line Edition. 8 May 2010.
- Appleyard, D, & Lintell, M (1972). The environmental quality of city streets: the residents' viewpoint. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 38(2), pages 84-101.
- Austrroads (2012). *Cycling on Higher Speed Roads*. AP-R410-12. Sydney, Australia.
- Austrroads (2015). *Review of the National Road Safety Strategy*. AP-R477-15. Sydney, Australia.
- Berkman, LF, & Syme, SL (1979). Social networks, host resistance, and mortality: a nine-year follow-up study of Alameda County residents. *American journal of Epidemiology*, 109(2), pages 186-204.
- BITRE (2014). *Road Safety: Modelling a Global Phenomenon*. Report 141, Canberra, Australia. Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development.
- Boss, A (2016). *Safe-Street Neighbourhoods*. BIKEast - Representing the community's interests in bicycle riding in Sydney's eastern suburbs.
- Bureau of Transport Statistics (2013). *Household Travel Survey (HTS)*. Electronic Publication No. E2013-35-HTS-Summary. Sydney, Australia. Transport for NSW.
- Calvert, T. (2016) Measure No. 6: Environmental zones. *World Transport Policy & Practice*, 22 (1/2). pp. 56-65
- Carver, A (2013). *30km/h Zones in Residential Areas: what difference would they make?* Bike Futures Conference, Melbourne, Australia.
- Corben, B. F., D'Elia, A., & Healy, D. (2006). Estimating pedestrian fatal crash risk. *Proceedings of the Australasian road safety research, policing and education conference (Vol. 10)*. Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.
- Cornwell, EY, & Waite, LJ (2009). Social disconnectedness, perceived isolation, and health among older adults. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 50(1), pages 31-48.
- Department of Transport and Main Roads Queensland (2015). *Providing for Cyclists at Roundabouts. Technical Note 136*. August 2015.
- Department of Transport WA (2017). *Safe Active Streets Program*.  
<http://www.transport.wa.gov.au/activetransport/safe-active-streets-program.asp>
- Department of Transport WA (2019a). *Special Data Request. STEM Data in 2016*.
- Department of Transport WA (2019b). *Special Data Request. RSIC 2926. Current Crash Cost by Crash Severity*.
- Dinh, DD, & Kubota, H (2013). Drivers' perceptions regarding speeding and driving on urban residential streets with a 30km/h speed limit. *International Association of Traffic and Safety Sciences Research*, 37(1), 30-38.
- European Federation of Road Traffic Victims (2013). WHY 30km/h? Retrieved from  
<http://doczz.fr/doc/2914203/why-30km-h---fevr-european-federation-of-road-traffic-vic...>

- Freeman, C., & Tranter, P (2011). *Children and their Urban Environment: Changing worlds*. London: Earthscan.
- Future Foundation (2006). *The Changing Face of Parenting: Professional Parenting, Information and Healthcare*. London: Future Foundation.
- Garrard, J (2008). *Safe Speed: Promoting safe walking and cycling by reducing traffic speed*. Heart Foundation. Melbourne, Australia.
- Grundy, C., Steinbach, R., Edwards, P., Green, J., Armstrong, B. and Wilkinson, P. (2009). Effect of 20 mph traffic speed zones on road injuries in London, 1986-2006: controlled interrupted time series analysis. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 339.
- Heinrich (2013). *30 km/h blanket speed limit – does it work?* Retrieved from <http://btawa.org.au/2013/08/05/30-kmh-blanket-speed-limit-does-it-work/>.
- Hoenig, M (2000). *The Graz traffic calming model and its consequences for cyclists*. Retrieved from <http://www.velomondial.net/velomondial2000/PDF/HONIG.PDF>.
- Hughes, T (2014, October). *The challenge of walking under a safe system*. Paper presented at Walk21. Sydney, Australia.
- Ingamells, S, & Raffle, A (2012). 20 mph speed limits are the right policy for sociability, safety, and a healthy population. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*. Page 345.
- King, R. and Semlyen, A. (2016) Some comments on Measure Review Number 6 specifically relating to 20mph/30kph policies and interventions, *World Transport Policy & Practice*, 22 (1/2). pp. 66-68.
- Kröyer, H. R. (2015). *Is 30km/h a 'safe' speed? Injury severity of pedestrians struck by a vehicle and the relation to travel speed and age*. IATSS research, 39(1), 42-50.
- Main Roads WA (2003). *Post 50 km/h Implementation Driver Speed Compliance. Western Australian Experience in Perth Metropolitan Area*. Authors: Brian Kidd and Tony Radalj.
- Main Roads WA (2019). *Special Data Request. Raw Crash Data from 1 January 1998 to 31 December 2018*.
- RMS (2019). *Special Data Request. Crashes by Severity, Speed Limit and Region from 1 January 2015 to 31 December 2017*.
- Rosén, E. & Sander, U. (2009). Pedestrian fatality risk as a function of car impact speed. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 41, 536-542.
- RTA (1999). *Economic Analysis Manual, Version 2*. Sydney, Australia.
- RTA (2011). *NSW Speed Zoning Guidelines, Version 4*. Sydney, Australia.
- Sammer, G (1994). *General 30kph speed limit in the city: The results of a model project in the city of Graz*.
- Stradling, S. G., Campbell, M., Allan, I. A., Gorell, R. S. J., Hill, J. P., Winter, M. G., & Hope, S. (2003). The speeding driver: who, how and why? *Scottish Executive Social Research*, Edinburgh.
- Supreme Court of Queensland (2012). *Perfect v MacDonald & Anor*. File Nos S350 of 2011.
- Svenson, O., Eriksson, G. & Gonzalez, N. (2012). Braking from different speeds: Judgments of collision speed if a car does not stop in time. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 45, 487-492.
- SWOV (2006). *Advancing Sustainable Safety: National Road Safety Outlook for 2005-2020*. Leidschendam, The Netherlands.

- SWOV (2010). *Effectiviteit en kosten van verkeersveiligheidsmaatregelen*. R-2010-9. Leidschendam, The Netherlands.
- Tolley, R (2014). *Director Walk21 - Personal Communications*. Sydney, Australia.
- Transport for NSW (2014). *Pedestrian Safety Action Plan 2014–20*. Pub 13.008. Sydney, Australia.
- Transport for NSW (2017). *Road Traffic Crashes in NSW: statistical statement for the year ending 31 December 2017 (and preceding years to 1997)*.
- Transport for NSW (2018). *Principles and Guidelines for Economic Appraisal of Transport Investment and Initiatives. Appendix 4 – Economic Parameter Values and Valuation Methodologies*. June 2018.
- Tranter, P (2010). Speed Kills: The Complex Links Between Transport, Lack of Time and Urban Health. *Journal of Urban Health*, 87(2). Pages 155-166.
- Tranter, P (2012). Effective speed: cycling because it's faster. *J Pucher & R Buehler (Eds), City Cycling* (pp. 57 - 74). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tranter, P (2014). Active travel: A cure for the hurry virus. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 21(1). Pages 65-76.
- Tranter, P, & Sharpe, S (2012). Disney-Pixar to the rescue: harnessing positive affect for enhancing children's active mobility. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 20(1), pages 34-40.
- van den Dool, D (1992). Seeking Safer Streets. *The Open Road*. October 1992. NRMA Publication. Sydney, Australia.
- van den Dool, D, Job, S (2014, November). *Pedestrian Safety – can we handle the next phase*. Wak21, Sydney, 2014.
- van den Dool, D, Tranter, P (2015, September). *Low speed environments – why most cities have them*. Asia Pacific Cycling Conference, Brisbane, Australia.
- Van Der Ploeg, H, Merom, D, Corpuz, G & Bauman, A (2008). Trends in Australian children traveling to school 1971-2003: Burning petrol or carbohydrates? *Preventive Medicine*, 46(1). Pages 60-62.
- Wallén, Warner & Åberg (2008). Drivers' beliefs about exceeding the speed limits. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*. 11, 376–389.
- Wegman, F (2012). *Driving down the road toll by building a Safe System*. Adelaide Thinker in Residence 2011–2012.
- Yeates, M (1996). Towards a safe urban speed limit. Report of the Cyclists Urban Speed Limit Taskforce of the Bicycle Federation of Australia. Retrieved from <http://www.yeatesit.biz/transfiles/bfaurbanspeedlimits.pdf>