

# STATES OF JERSEY



## **REVIEW OF SPEED LIMITS: REVISED POLICY (S.R.4/2011) – RESPONSE OF THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT AND TECHNICAL SERVICES**

---

**Presented to the States on 12th December 2011  
by the Minister for Transport and Technical Services**

---

**STATES GREFFE**

**REVIEW OF SPEED LIMITS: REVISED POLICY (S.R.4/2011) – RESPONSE  
OF THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT AND TECHNICAL SERVICES**

<b>Ministerial Response to:</b>	S.R.4/2011
<b>Review title:</b>	Review of Speed Limits: Revised Policy
<b>Scrutiny Panel:</b>	Environment

Although acknowledging that this formal response to the Environment Scrutiny Panel is overdue, I would wish to record that the previous Minister for Transport and Technical Services (TTS) acknowledged the Panel's review, both by meeting the Panel on 19th April and subsequently by letter on 1st July 2011. I concur with the previous Minister's response at the time, which I summarise as follows:

The findings of the report S.R.4/2011 are noted, and given that the States subsequently decided to defer the Minister's proposition (P.167/2010) to a later meeting, I am obliged to accept that the report is not ready for debate in its current form. This would suggest that a significant body of work should be carried out to address the many findings listed below and to produce a new speed limits policy. I am required by the States (under P.104/2010 – Sustainable Transport Policy and 1st amendment thereto) to apply appropriate measures to re-establish a reducing trend in road injury rates, to identify a specific trend target for accident reduction, and to inform the States of the rationale behind it. Rather than embark on a fresh review of speed limits, my Department's resources would be better applied to assisting the Road Safety Strategy Group which has been established and is developing proposals for a road safety strategy. That Group will carry out a researched piece of work covering all aspects of road safety. Speed limit policy is one of several issues which can be expected to have an impact on road safety, and I will ensure that the Group considers its significance in meeting the accident reduction target. That work will establish whether or not a new full speed limits review is necessary, or whether my Department's resources could be used more effectively elsewhere. My comments on the specific findings and recommendations follow.

	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	<b>The Working Group's review of speed limit policy was not carried out to an acceptable standard. No meaningful research was done, and no aims and objectives were ever defined other than to look at the existing policy.</b>	<p>The aims and objectives were taken from the States proposition P.166/2008 (as reproduced below), a Group was set up in accordance with the proposition, and that group conducted what it considered to be an appropriate level of research in order to draw its conclusions.</p> <p>Proposition P.166/2008 –</p> <p>to request the Minister for Transport and Technical Services –</p> <p>(a) to establish a Review Working Group to review the implementation, operation and suitability of the current Speed Limits Policy (P.1/2004) as approved by the States on 15th March 2005;</p> <p>(b) to appoint 3 States members as members of the Review Working Group of whom at least 2, including the Chairman, shall not be Ministers or Assistant Ministers, with the Working Group to receive appropriate assistance from relevant officers; and</p> <p>(c) to present the conclusions of the Review Working Group with any associated recommendations for change to the Assembly before 30th June 2009 (<i>subsequently amended to 30th September 2009</i>).</p>
2	<b>Evidence of key issues such as actual speeds and accident records was never considered; consequently public concerns about road safety were not addressed.</b>	<p>The Group did not undertake any new detailed analysis of road accidents and their relationship with road speed and speed limits, though some investigation had been carried out by TTS on these issues in the past, and TTS officers advised the Group appropriately.</p>
3	<b>The only substantial consultation carried out (the public survey) was so seriously flawed in methodology and interpretation that its results are wholly unrepresentative and seriously misleading.</b>	<p>It is accepted that there were flaws in the interpretation of the public survey. The most significant consequence of this was that the Group's report claimed that 67% of public respondents supported increasing the green lane speed limit to 20 m.p.h., when the correct percentage could have been much lower. However, re-adjustment of the analysis in light of the recognised flaws identified an even higher level of support for key parts of the policy, specifically 40 m.p.h. remaining as the Island's</p>

	<b>Key Findings</b>	<b>Comments</b>
		maximum limit, 30 m.p.h. the limit in urban areas, and 20 m.p.h. the limit in housing areas and part-time at schools.
4	<b>Other public consultation was inadequate; no stakeholders were even identified.</b>	The Group considered that an extensive and well-advertised public consultation, combined with consultation with the States and Honorary Police, was sufficient.
5	<b>The Department did not identify the failings of the Working Group's report or carry out any consultation of its own before the Minister lodged his proposition.</b>	Noted. The Department and Minister considered the Group's public consultation, public meeting and discussions with the States and Honorary Police to be comprehensive enough to enable the States to be asked to decide whether the policy should be adopted or not.
6	<b>Aspects of the proposition have the potential for negative impacts on road safety, compliance with speed limits, and enforcement.</b>	With the exception of green lanes, which were proposed to increase from 15 to 20 m.p.h., the proposed policy would result in generally lower speed limits and therefore be unlikely to have a negative impact on road safety. The proposal for a default 30 m.p.h. on roads without white centre lines would require a period of education and publicity, but there is precedent in that the public are expected to know of other default lower speed limits without signage, for instance 30 m.p.h. for vehicles over 3.5 t. or when towing a trailer.
7	<b>The proposition is considered unsound and unfit for purpose.</b>	As the States agreed to defer consideration, I am obliged to accept that it is not ready for debate in its current form.

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Accept/ Reject</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Target date of action/ completion</b>
1	<b>The proposition in its present form should be withdrawn by the Minister.</b>	TTS	Accept	The States voted in favour of a deferment and the policy will be reconsidered before any new proposition is lodged.	
2	<b>In the event that Recommendation 1 is not accepted, the States should reject the proposition.</b>			See above.	
3	<b>The Transport and Technical Services Department should change their culture to recognise the value of genuine consultation. This should involve an awareness of the importance of engaging with others, training in consultation techniques, and respect for States guidelines.</b>	TTS	Reject	TTS, overall, has a proven culture of good consultation, though in this instance it is accepted that a further (White Paper) consultation when a proposed policy had been drafted would have been advisable.	
4	<b>In future, before bringing a proposition to the House, the Minister should ensure that it is fit for purpose, based on solid evidence, and a proper consultation process has been followed.</b>	TTS	Accept	The Minister considered that there was sufficient evidence for the States to be able to consider the policy, but it is accepted, following the States' decision by 26 votes to 21 to defer consideration, that this view was not supported by the majority of States members.	
5	<b>The practice of appointing Panels of States Members to review specific aspects of policy has clearly failed in this instance. In future, consideration should be given to making better use of Scrutiny for these purposes.</b>	All	Accept	The Minister would be pleased to make better use of Scrutiny (the Environment Scrutiny Panel will recall that the development of the Sustainable Transport Policy involved considerable Scrutiny involvement during the policy development).	

	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Accept/ Reject</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Target date of action/ completion</b>
				With regard to the speed limit policy, the Minister was obliged to follow the direction of the original Proposition (P.166/2008), which specified a different approach.	
6	<b>The Department should bring forward effective policies to improve road safety, based on evidence and proper consultation, in line with the above Recommendations.</b>	TTS	Accept	The Minister is in the process of developing a road safety strategy, which will set a target for road injury reductions and explain the rationale behind that target, using appropriate evidence and consultation.	End 2012

## **Conclusions**

It is accepted that the work of the Speed Limit Review Group could have involved a more detailed statistical analysis, although how much this would have influenced the outcome is debatable. TTS had carried out more detailed statistical studies in the past which had not led to the application of a consistent and robust policy. The Group chose to develop its policy based on discussions with key parties such as the States and Honorary Police, and also felt it was representing the general public's views, having run a well-advertised public consultation. It is accepted, however, that a further consultation on the developed proposals would have been advisable and helped inform a subsequent States debate.

TTS is currently leading a Road Safety Strategy Group, and that Group will be asked to consider the contribution that speed limits have to make to road safety. Further consideration of speed limit policy has therefore been deferred until the Group's work has been concluded.