



Faculty of Public Health

of the Royal Colleges of Physicians of the United Kingdom

Working to improve the public's health

Response from the Faculty of Public Health to the Department for Transport's consultation on Road Safety Compliance

1. Introduction

The Faculty of Public Health (FPH) is the leading professional body for public health specialists in the UK. It aims to advance the health of the population through three key areas of work: health promotion, health protection and healthcare improvement. In addition to maintaining professional and educational standards for specialists in public health, FPH advocates on key public health issues and provides practical information and guidance for public health professionals.

The Faculty of Public Health welcomes the opportunity to respond to the DfT's Road Safety Compliance Consultation. We are delighted that the Government is considering further ways to reduce the toll of premature mortality and morbidity caused by road traffic collisions.

In our response, we address the five issues to varying extents. Our basic premises are that transport affects both health and health inequalities, and that an evidence-based approach should be used. However, 'no evidence' should not be confused with 'evidence of no effect'.

We also make some more general points about approaches to road safety that promote the public's health. We have noted that this particular consultation is of limited scope and complements other DfT initiatives, such as vehicle standards, road engineering and public education, and that the Department will be developing a new 10-year road safety strategy next year.

We were disappointed to see that the word 'accident' crept into the consultation document in a few places (eg para 2.3): although the word 'accident' means 'unintentional', it is interpreted by many people as 'unavoidable', so the general consensus is to avoid the term where possible and use 'collision' or 'injuries', as appropriate (as you have done in most places in the document).

2. Speeding

2.1 Need for lower speeds

We agree that existing speed limits need to be enforced, both through driver compliance and identifying and penalising offenders.

The largest impact on reducing deaths and injuries will come from reducing urban speeds from 30-40mph to 20mph.

However, in addition to reducing driving speed to reduce both the risks and the consequences of collisions, there are a number of other benefits of lower traffic speed.

Perceived danger from traffic leads to restrictions on children's independent mobility,¹ with consequent increases in motor vehicle traffic to transport children concomitant decreases in fitness in children who no longer walk and cycle at will. The Government's new strategy for children² includes the vision that *'routes to children's play space are safe and accessible for all children and young people'*.

Community severance arises when roads bearing high levels of traffic and/or fast traffic cut through housing areas. The physical presence of the traffic, particularly heavy goods vehicles, as well as the perceived or real risk of collisions presents a barrier to the community, limiting or disrupting interpersonal networks and reducing social contact.³ These effects are associated with higher mortality and morbidity in the elderly⁴ and possibly with worse mental health more generally. A proportion of local residents is cut off from safe and easy access to shops, schools and other facilities as well as from their social network.

Heavy volumes of, but particularly fast, traffic also reduces the use of residential streets as play areas for children,⁵ a topic of current concern,² and reduce physically active transport, particularly important given the rise in obesity.⁶ A survey published in 2006 found that that 68% of participants worry about being killed on foot and 36% of people who never cycle on the roads do so for reasons which include a fear of traffic.⁷

2.2 Size of the problem

We disagree with paragraph 1.12 of the DfT Consultation document: *"On this basis, our current legal framework is largely fit for purpose. For the most part it is complied with by consensus without the need for any intervention or enforcement. Most drivers refrain from bad driving voluntarily."* Speeding is very common, but being caught for speeding is uncommon. More needs to be done not only on law enforcement but also to improve compliance, particularly by changing attitudes to speeding (see section 7 below).

2.3 Response to consultation questions

We do not have specific expertise to comment on the actual penalties that should be imposed, so have not answered every consultation question. Our response to the consultation highlights the areas where it is important that the public in general and drivers in particular change their behaviour and also their underlying attitudes. This may well be through increasing the penalties, or catching and penalising a much higher proportion of offenders, or both.

1. Do you agree that extreme speeders should receive a 6-point fixed penalty?

We would welcome a proposed increase in penalty points, particularly for those who exceed the speed limit by a larger margin, if it helps to change public attitudes to the seriousness of speeding. However, because it is so very much more common, there are probably more collisions and more injuries caused by slight speeding than by substantial speeding, particularly given that the consultation document makes it clear that 'speeding' includes driving within the speed limit but too fast for the conditions at the time.

2. Do you think that 20/30 mph limited roads should have a lower threshold for a 6-point penalty?

We are horrified that the Government is even considering having a threshold of 40mph for incurring a higher penalty for speeding in a 20mph area (Table 2.3). This is worse than using 140mph as the threshold in a 70 mph area, given the paucity of pedestrians on motorways and dual carriageways, compared with residential 20mph zones.

We would recommend the threshold for the proposed higher penalty being 30mph in a 20mph zone, which would really get the message across quickly and simply (see section 7 below).

For 30mph zones, we would strongly recommend the lower of the two proposed thresholds (45mph) for the higher penalty, unless there is an option of selecting 40mph as the threshold.

These fit with the Government's principles of being simple, clear, and applying to 'excessive speeders' (para 2.40).

2.4 Other important issues related to speed limits

In parallel with measures to improve compliance with speed limits, we strongly recommend the following two measures to improve road safety for all road users, especially children, older people, and those in deprived circumstances:

- 20mph speed limit as the norm in residential areas; and
- much greater use of Home Zones.

Reducing travel speed from 30 mph to 20 mph reduces the risk of killing a pedestrian by about 95%.⁸ This is both because the lower speed allows more time to reduce speed still further to prevent a collision and because if a collision did occur, injury severity is reduced. One study found that 20 mph zones reduced collisions causing any injury by 60%, while collisions resulting in child deaths and serious injuries were reduced by 70%.⁹ The Transport Research Laboratory found that 20 mph zones reduce all injuries by 42% and deaths and serious injuries by 53%.¹⁰ 20 mph zones in Hull have reduced the number of people killed and seriously injured by 90%.¹¹ The greater benefit in Hull may be because such a high proportion of residential streets were included in the 20mph zones that driver behaviour changed across wider areas of Hull, so a nationwide limit of 20mph may have even greater benefits than the imposition of 20mph zones in local areas. The Department for Transport and the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (now Department of Communities and Local Government) published the *Manual for Streets*,¹² which, makes the case for 20mph limits for all streets where people should have priority over traffic. We believe this applies to all residential streets.

A home zone is a street or group of streets where pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles share the space on equal terms, with cars travelling at little more than walking pace. Home zones subvert the traditional distinction between carriageway and footway. The Transport and Health Study Group are providing more information about Home Zones and their benefits in their response to this consultation.

3. Drink driving

3.1 Responses to consultation questions

6. Do you have any comments on the use of targeted checkpoint testing for drink drivers?

We support both random testing and targeted checkpoint testing to detect drink drivers.

7. Do you think we should withdraw the statutory right to a blood or urine test as an alternative to a breath test?

8. Please comment on three options in respect of the proposal to take away cover for High Risk Offenders (HROs) to drive after submitting a reapplication for a licence, while medical procedures are being carried out.

We have no particular views and are happy to accept an evidence-based decision on what has the greatest deterrent /beneficial impact on compliance, provided it does not unfairly deny a defence to those suspected or violating the law.

9. Do you agree that the costs of implementing and enforcing a judicial alcohol ignition interlock scheme would be disproportionate?

We have no particular views and are happy to accept an evidence-based decision on what has the greatest deterrent /beneficial impact on compliance

3.2 The legal alcohol limit for driving

10. What priority do you think should be given to a change in the prescribed alcohol limit for driving?

This should be given high priority. The advantage of introducing a legal limit for blood alcohol of 20mg/ml is that no alcohol can be consumed to remain within the legal limit. Lowering the legal limit to 50mg/ml will improve safety and will encourage many drivers to drink no alcohol, rather than a little (addressing the problem identified in para 3.15), but the current problems of individuals not knowing how their intake relates to subsequent blood concentrations will remain (para 3.10). Reducing the legal limit will make your plans in para 3.18 easier to achieve.

Indeed, the DETR had plans in 1998 to reduce the limit to 50mg/100ml.¹³ This reduction would bring the UK in line with the European Commission Recommendation adopted in January 2001.

11. What evidence are you able to offer – and what further evidence do you consider should be obtained – to support a fully-considered decision whether or not to change the limit?

We are concerned that you have included Figure 3.2 in the consultation document without adding the critique of this work that has been published and is well known to the DfT. Professor Allsop of UCL (University College London) has addressed this in his detailed submission. In brief, the flaws in the figures in the Borkenstein report¹⁴ on which figure 3.2 is based was known to the Ministry of Transport in 1965 and a critique was published by Allsop in 1996.¹⁵ Compton et al¹⁶ corroborated Allsop's interpretation of the data. Allsop also demonstrated in 1966 that the lower relative risk among drivers with blood alcohol levels of 10-40mg/ml arose not from a

beneficial effect of low alcohol levels but because those driving with those levels of alcohol were also those who were on average less likely to be involved in a collision, due to their age, experience, etc. However, when sub-group analyses were conducted, there was an increased risk of collision for every category of driver from a blood alcohol level of 10mg/ml upwards.¹⁵ This was the basis, from the Grand Rapids study,¹⁴ for the statement in para 3.18 of the consultation that 'every driver is safer not drinking at all'. This statement has been supported by a good deal of other evidence since then, including the fourth column of Table 1 in Compton et al¹⁶ in terms of involvement in road traffic crashes.

Para 3.11 acknowledges this but the document fails to make the obvious recommendation, to reduce the legal limit.

The evidence for a beneficial effect on road traffic injuries and fatalities was summarised in 2005.¹⁷ The current legal limit of 80mg/ml was set in 1967, on the basis of the research evidence available at the time, principally the Grand Rapids study,¹⁴ which provided evidence of increased risk of involvement in road traffic collisions after drinking alcohol that was unprecedented and incontrovertible in terms of sample size and experimental design, in a way that has since been replicated only in the study by Compton et al.¹⁶ The Grand Rapids study indicated that average collision risk was at least doubled – and therefore, by implication, so was the risk of injury or death – at this level, with this risk being statistically significantly raised above the risk for no alcohol.

Over the intervening 40 years, further scientific evidence strongly supports a reduction in the legal limit to prevent drink driving. Alcohol intake that produces breath alcohol levels of half the current legal limits for driving result in substantial impairment of judgement when driving, when combined with only a moderate reduction in sleep.¹⁸ A large study in the USA in the 1990s found that crash risk doubled above a blood alcohol level of 70mg/100ml.¹⁶ Considering only road traffic collisions which result in personal injury, the relative risk of involvement in an injury crash is estimated from British data to be 2.9 at a BAC of 50mg/100ml and 5.6 at a BAC of 80mg/100ml compared with the risk with zero BAC; the similarly estimated relative risks of being killed in a collision are 5.0 and 12.4 respectively.¹⁹ Allsop has pointed out that drivers' risk of involvement in or death from injury crashes at a BAC of 80mg/100ml are respectively nearly three and more than six times the doubling that informed the setting of the limit at 80mg/100ml in 1967.¹⁷ Indeed, it is now known that the risks at the lower BAC of 50mg/100ml are 1.5 and 2.5 times as high as the risk was estimated to be at 80mg/100ml in 1967. Re-analysis of the Grand Rapids dataset informed by subsequent studies demonstrating harm not benefit from alcohol in the blood has shown a statistically significant doubling of the risk of collision at 60mg/100ml.¹⁷

In 1998, the DETR estimated that about 50 deaths and 250 serious injuries annually would be prevented by reducing the legal limit to 50mg/100ml.¹³ Allsop has calculated the consequences of plausible assumptions about the effect on driver behaviour of reducing the limit to 50mg/100ml, by category of current BAC.¹⁷ He estimated a short-term reduction of 40 deaths pa among those with current BAC 80-110mg/100ml and 23 deaths pa among those with current BAC 50-80mg/100ml. In addition, there would probably be fewer KSI collisions among those who are already below BAC of 50mg/100ml if they reduced their alcohol intake further in response to the new lower limit, given that any alcohol is now known to impair driving, plus a longer-term cohort effect whereby older drivers who grew up believing drink-driving was acceptable are replaced by younger drivers who do not.

We support the Transport Select Committee's proposal of a 20 mg/100 ml limit for new drivers (para 3.65). This could be introduced for the first five years after gaining a driving licence or until the age of 25, whichever is later. We see that there is a risk *that 'allowing more drinking*

once they cease to be 'novices' would convey the wrong message at the wrong time' but this would be lessened by reducing the legal limit to 50mg/ml.

The alternative, for which a strong case can also be made, is to reduce the legal limit for all drivers to 20mg/ml, on the grounds that there is evidence of impairment above that level. It has the additional advantage of leading to a very clear 'drink no alcohol at all if you're going to drive' message, rather than drivers guessing how much they can drink while remaining below the legal limit.

3.3 Other points

It is important that when an individual is convicted of a drink-driving offence, that s/he is assessed by a specialist regarding alcohol use, to identify those with problem drinking and to offer treatment. Acceptance of treatment by specialist alcohol services where appropriate could be considered a prerequisite for resuming driving at the end of the disqualification.

4. Drug driving

12. Do you agree that a new offence of driving with an illegal drug in the body is required to make the regulation of drug driving more effective?

We do not have the expertise to comment on the options in para 5.50, regarding whether a new offence rather than enhanced awareness by the public of the current law, combined with changes to make detection and enforcement easier by the police, is the better option. If there is no evidence available to answer this question, it should be sought or commissioned.

13. Do you think that such a new offence should apply to illegal drugs only, and not those that have been legally prescribed or obtained?

No. The relevant factor is whether or not there is impairment, not whether the drug is illegal or not, nor whether it is being used as directed or not. To do otherwise would imply punitive action against drugs merely because of their legal status, rather because of their effects.

The only reason for distinguishing illegal from prescribed drugs is if there is good evidence that all illegal drugs impair driving, as does almost all levels of alcohol, and therefore any evidence of driving when having used an illegal drug should be an offence. However, the logical sequela of this approach would be that a blood alcohol level of 20mg/100ml should be introduced for all drivers.

14. How do you think we should identify the drugs that would be the subject of the proposed offence? How should we incorporate new drugs under the proposed offence?

15. Do you have any other comments about the proposed new offence?

16. Do you have any other comments about our drug driving proposals?

We do not have the expertise to comment on these but support an evidence-based approach that maximises health gain and reduces inequalities.

5. Careless driving

5.1 Proposal to make 'careless driving' a fixed penalty offence

17. Do you agree that we should make careless driving a fixed penalty offence?

In theory, we agree with the proposal in para 6.19 to make '*careless driving that is not dangerous driving and did not result in death*' a fixed penalty offence, if it significantly increases the likelihood of someone driving carelessly being stopped and given points on their licence, rather than this happening only after s/he has been involved in a collision.

However, it would need to be made very clear to the general public as well as to the police:

- what behaviours are covered by this (eg if it covers eating, smoking, or drinking while driving as well as poor driving itself); and
- what standard of driving would lead to a court case rather than a fixed penalty.

18. Do you agree that the fixed penalty for careless driving should be £60 and 3 penalty points?

We do not have the expertise to comment on this but support an evidence-based approach that maximises health gain and reduces inequalities.

19. Do you have any further comments about our careless driving proposals?

See section 5.2 below.

5.2 Use of mobile telephones while driving

Currently, legislation prohibits the use of hand-held mobile telephones but permits hands-free devices. This is a step in the right direction but is insufficient. The evidence shows that driver distraction is indeed greatest where hand-held mobile devices are used, but the bulk of the distraction occurs from engaging in a telephone conversation, regardless of whether the device is hand-held or hands-free. This distraction is greater than that experienced by listening to the radio or conversing with passengers, although these activities can also distract, because when the road requires additional concentration, it is harder to break off the conversation or stop listening when on a mobile phone compared with in-car conversations or radio.

We recommend that use of any mobile telephone while driving is prohibited. This could be implemented at the same time as the careless driving fixed penalty notice is implemented.

- We recommend that use of any mobile telephone while driving attracts a fixed penalty notice except where a more serious offence has been committed, for example if it contributes to 'dangerous driving' or 'causing death by ... driving'.

6. Driver retraining and re-assessment

20. Do you think we should specify a retraining course for cases where a vocational licence has been revoked on the advice of the Traffic Commissioners?

Yes, if there is evidence to support the use of retraining courses.

21. Do you think that disqualified drivers who are subject to a re-test should be required to take remedial training first?

Yes, if there is evidence to support the use of remedial training.

22. Do you agree that we should develop a course for people who incur penalties while subject to the New Drivers Act, linked to a new assessment for the recovery of a revoked licence?

Yes, if there is evidence to support the use of such courses. If there is no such evidence (for 20-22), studies should be commissioned or these should be implemented as pilot studies with good quality evaluation included in the study.

23. Please comment on the three options for the proposal in question 22

We support the introduction of remedial training for those affected by the New Drivers Act. Whether this should be as well as disqualification or whether it should be allowed to mitigate the number of penalty points depends on the evidence. Specifically, would the latter option reduce the number of disqualified drivers who drive uninsured (and without a licence) merely by re-categorising them or would it actually improve individual and population level driving standards, given that some who are currently disqualified presumably do not drive and do pass a subsequent re-test? If there is no evidence, then two or three options could be piloted in different areas, with a final decision resting on a formal evaluation of the pilot projects.

24. Do you think we should change the rules relating to designated countries in the New Drivers Act? If so, how?

We have no expertise on this.

25. Do you have any further comments on our proposals on driver retraining and re-assessment?

We support the recommendation to require re-testing of all drivers who have been disqualified for at least two years (paras 3.43 & 7.19:). Ideally, one would also desire evidence of changes in attitude and behaviour towards the cause of the disqualification (eg drink driving) – if this is what para 7.24 is advocating, we support that recommendation as well.

Para 7.32 (Re-testing to lift disqualification for drivers previously licensed to drive more than one category of vehicle): It seems logical to us that any re-test should cover at least the type of vehicle in which the offense occurred or the type of vehicle with the most stringent testing, if not both, rather than any category of vehicle.

7. Compliance and enforcement

7.1 Enforcement

Our areas of expertise lie in the assessment of evidence, particularly in relation to health, so we are not responding directly to some of the various suggestions regarding how compliance should be encouraged, enforced, and monitored. However, two crucial elements for compliance and enforcement for all these areas (but perhaps particularly for speeding) are:

- denormalisation, where it is no longer perceived as acceptable or as the social norm to ignore such laws; and
- criminalisation of such law-breaking. By this we mean that the general public, drivers, the police, the judiciary, and policy-makers believe that breaking these laws is criminal behaviour not just 'naughty'.

These two elements are mutually reinforcing. This has to a large extent happened with drink-driving: anecdotal evidence suggests that, except in individuals with problems of excessive alcohol use, many individuals who drive while over the legal limit do so through confusion over the amount they can drink before that limit is reached. This is an additional reason to lower the legal limit, so that the simple message of 'if you're driving, don't drink' can replace the current perception of 'if you're driving, don't drink very much'.

Speeding, however, is regarded by large sections of the general public as normal behaviour. Unfortunately, it is not true to describe those who speed as a '*reckless few*' (your document section 1.14). Indeed, the consultation document refers to 70% of drivers admitting to speeding (para 2.1). Otherwise intelligent people believe that to speed is sensible, as it reduces journey time, and is safe, as they personally have never caused injury or death by their excellent driving. This is perhaps best addressed by sophisticated social marketing techniques, as are being used in the TravelWise campaign and are also being developed by the Department of Health to encourage healthy lifestyles. All education materials and modes (eg leaflets, broadcasts, posters) need to be tested with the target population, not just with those commissioning the materials, to ensure the correct messages are being received.

To this end, we disagree with paragraph 1.22: "*progressive decriminalisation (through the Traffic Management Act) of traffic offences that cause inconvenience or congestion (eg parking in bus lanes) but do not threaten life and limb.*" We believe that one of the problems is that traffic offences are NOT perceived by the general public or by policy-makers and the judicial system as criminal offences and are therefore considered unimportant and are readily flouted.

7.2 Promoting compliance

The other reasons to reduce driving speeds (discussed above) may also be useful in public education campaigns to aid compliance, as the fairness argument is harder to rationalise away, compared with the '*I don't cause collisions because I'm a safe driver*' argument.

8. Road safety and public health

8.1 Impact on inequalities

The advantages of private transport accrue principally to the better-off; the disadvantages impact primarily on more deprived people. Inequitable negative effects include community severance and social exclusion (due to dependence on public modes of transport), as well as important inequality effects in all the other categories of impact.

There are important inequality issues with respect to road collisions. One effects is by different types of road users - pedestrians and cyclists have higher levels of fatal and serious casualties from collisions with other road users. Children from social class V have five times the mortality rate from road traffic collisions as children from social class I.²⁰ There are also links between modal choice and social class and also with vulnerable groups, particularly children. Some of these inequalities themselves lead to additional secondary effects – fear of injury is one of the reasons children are driven to school. In areas with much traffic children do not play on the streets. Both encourage sedentary lifestyles.

8.2 Promoting physically-active transport and independent mobility for children and older people

We welcome the Government's approach to road safety in this document that focuses on reducing the threat to vulnerable road users from drivers who cannot exercise sufficient judgement or take sufficient care, complementing other documents that focus on road engineering and other measures. It is important that vulnerable road users are protected by legislation, education of drivers, and enforcement where necessary, as well as by providing pleasant, safe, traffic-free routes for walking and cycling.

However, it is important to remember that the most effective way of having no pedestrian fatalities is to have no pedestrians, and that the health benefits of walking and cycling greatly outweigh the risk from traffic injuries. For example, it has been calculated that for every year of life lost from cycling injuries, 20 years of life are gained, on average,²¹ and that the injury rates fall as the number of pedestrians and cyclists increase.^{22 23} Any injury-reduction targets should therefore be accompanied by targets to increase the number of people who walk (especially children and older people) and cycle (especially children and women), to encourage health-promoting and environmentally-sustainable transport and ensure it is increased not decreased by road safety measures.

8.3 Broader issues

As outlined in section 2.1 above, speeding traffic causes substantial impacts apart from the road traffic deaths and injuries quantified in the Government's consultation document. By discouraging physically active transport, it contributes to obesity, heart disease, stroke, diabetes, depression, osteoporosis, and some forms of cancer.²⁴ Limiting independent mobility among children, older people and those without access to private transport and with limited access to public transport reduces mental well-being and self-esteem.²⁵

Cycling at 10mph uses 29kJ/min on average, adequate for health benefits.²⁶ Walking a mile in 20 minutes (slower than the 3.5 – 4.5mph most often recommended for health benefits to accrue to the middle-aged²⁷) expends the same amount of energy as cycling at 9.4mph for 16 minutes, running a mile in 10 minutes, swimming breast stroke for 10 minutes, medium-intensity aerobic dancing for 16 minutes, or playing football for 12 minutes.²⁸

Regular “brisk” or “fast” walking can improve cardiovascular fitness.²⁹ Walking at ≥ 6.4 km/h for >3.5 hrs/wk halved the risk of first coronary event or fatal IHD in 9½ years follow-up ($p<0.001$).²⁹ Brisk/fast walking by the average man could use sufficient energy to be classed as vigorous in this study.^{30,34} The age-standardised death rate from IHD was also inversely related to speed of usual walking pace. Those who strolled had a high rate of co-morbidity, were otherwise sedentary, and were more often smokers. IHD deaths and hospital admissions were reduced in older people who walked >4 h/wk compared with <1 h/wk (RR 0.74), even when adjusted for other, more vigorous activities.²⁹

Exercise tolerance and quality of life in people with congestive heart failure can be increased and fatigue and shortness of breath reduced by a progressive walking programme, increasing from 10km/wk at 13min/km to 21km/wk at 11.5min/km.²⁹ Relatively low intensity walking appears to suffice to improve the symptom of intermittent claudication.²⁹

Walking also enhances insulin sensitivity and glucose uptake into muscle.²⁹ Effective activity in preventing diabetes included “very brisk walking” (≥ 8.0 km/hr) or “brisk walking on soft surfaces such as sand or grass”.²⁹ Brisk walking in middle-aged or slower walking in older people would be sufficient activity (50-60% of VO_{2max}) to maintain stable blood glucose levels.²⁹

Bone density is higher in the legs and trunk of postmenopausal women who habitually walked >12 km/wk compared with those who walked <1.6 km/wk.²⁹ Aerobic activity, including walking, jogging or cycling, can improve stamina.²⁹ In healthy sedentary adults, walking led to reductions in mood disturbance in women and increased positive affect in men. Different intensities of walking all improved quality of well-being in people with chronic pulmonary disease in proportion to improvement in exercise tolerance in comparison with controls. Walking improved pain in people with osteoarthritis and reduced anxiety and depression.³¹ Other benefits to well-being occur from companionship and pleasant physical surroundings.³²

Walking uses 4kJ/kg bodyweight, almost independent of pace, so walking more slowly than needed to increase fitness still aids weight control. For example, one mile on the level requires 272kJ for a 75kg man and more in heavier individuals.²⁹

Incorporating activity into routine daily living can facilitate better compliance with the recommendations for physical activity by the general population than requiring attendance at sports facilities.³³ It is cheaper, less demanding of additional time, and more readily accessible, important considerations since costs, lack of time, and lack of facilities are the main reasons given for inactivity.²⁶

These effects are much harder to quantify but probably exceed the road traffic injuries and fatalities by an order of magnitude.

Finally, we recommend that NICE, the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, should include DfT amongst those organisations to whom its public health programme guidance recommendations are directed. For example, 2008 guidance on physical activity and the environment mentions the NHS and local authorities in relation to recommendations to reduce and enforce speed limits but omits the DfT.³⁴

9. References

- 1 Hillman M, Adams J, Whitelegg J. *One false move: a study of children's independent mobility*. London: PSI Publishing, 1990.
- 2 Department for Children, Schools and Families. *The Play Strategy*. London: DCSF, 2008. www.dcsf.gov.uk/play/
- 3 Appleyard D, Lintell M. The environmental quality of city streets: The residents' viewpoint. *American Institute of Planners Journal* 1972;**38**:84-101.
- 4 Welin L, Larsson B, Svärdsudd K *et al.* Social network and activities in relation to mortality from cardiovascular diseases, cancer and other causes: a 12 year follow up of the Study of Men Born in 1913 and 1923. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*. 1992;**46**:127-132.
- 5 Sherlock H. *Cities are good for us*. London: Paladin, 1991.
- 6 Craig R, Mindell J (eds). *Health Survey for England 2006*. London: NHS Information Centre, 2008.
- 7 Brake, Green Flag. *A Risky Business—The Green Flag Report on Safe Driving Part Four*. Huddersfield: Brake, 2006.
- 8 Slower Speeds Initiative. *Written evidence to the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee on Environmental Audit*. London: House of Commons, 2006. www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmselect/cmenvaud/981/981we57.htm
- 9 Webster DC, Mackie AM. *Review of traffic calming schemes in 20 mph zones*. TRL Report 215. Crowthorne, Bucks: Transport Research Laboratory, 1996.
- 10 Transport for London Street Management. *A review of 20 mph Zones in London Boroughs*, London Road Safety Unit Research Report No 2. London: Transport for London, 2003.
- 11 Kingston-upon-Hull City Council. *20 mph zones in Kingston-upon-Hull*. Hull: Kingston-upon-Hull CC, 2000.
- 12 Department for Transport. *Manual for Streets*. London: DfT, 2007. www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/manforstreets
- 13 Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions. *Combating drink driving: next steps*. London: DETR, 1998
- 14 Borkenstein R F, Crowther RF, Shumate RP, Zeil WW, Zylman R. *The role of the drinking driver in traffic accidents* Bloomington: Department of Police Administration, Indiana University, 1964.
- 15 Allsop R. *Alcohol and Road Accidents. RRL Report No.6*. Harmondsworth, England: Road Research Laboratory, Ministry of Transport, 1996.
- 16 Compton RP, Blomberg RD, Moskowitz H, Burns M, Peck RC, Fiorentino D. *Crash risk of alcohol impaired driving*. Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety, Montreal, August 2002
- 17 Allsop R. *Some reasons for lowering the legal drink-drive limit in Britain*. London: Centre for Transport Studies, UCL, 2005.
- 18 Horne JA, Barrett PR, Reyner LA. *Interactions between sleepiness and moderate alcohol intake in drivers*. Road Safety Research Report No. 62. London: Department for Transport, 2006.
- 19 Maycock G. *Drinking and driving in Great Britain – a review. TRL Report 232*. Crowthorne: Transport Research Laboratory, 1997.
- 20 Roberts I, Diguseppi C, Ward H. Childhood injuries: extent of the problem, epidemiological trends, and costs. *Injury Prevention*. 1998;**4**:S10-S16.
- 21 Hillman, M. 1992, *Cycling: towards health and safety* British Medical Association, London.
- 22 Jacobsen PL. Safety in numbers: more walkers and bicyclists, safer walking and bicycling. *Injury Prevention*. 2003;**9**:205-9.
- 23 Leden L. Pedestrian risk decrease with pedestrian flow. A case study based on data from signalized intersections in Hamilton, Ontario. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*. 2002;**34**:457-64.

- 24 Donaldson L. *At least five a week – evidence on the impact of physical activity and its relationship to health. A report from the Chief Medical Officer*. London: Department of Health, 2004.
- 25 Hannah J, Morton S, Watkins S. *Health on the move : policies for health promoting transport . The policy statement of the Transport and Health Study Group*. Birmingham: Public Health Alliance, 1991.
- 26 Shephard RJ. What is the optimal type of physical activity to enhance health? [see comments]. *Br.J Sports Med* 1997;**31**:277-84.
- 27 Lumsdon L, Mitchell J. Walking, transport and health : do we have the right prescription? *Health Promotion International* 1999;**14**:271-9.
- 28 Greater Glasgow Health Board, University of Glasgow, Health Education Board for Scotland. *Walk in to work out*. Glasgow: HEBS, 1999.
- 29 Morris JN, Hardman AE. Walking to health [published erratum appears in Sports Med 1997 Aug;24(2):96]. *Sports Med* 1997;**23**:306-32.
- 30 Hardman AE. Exercise in the prevention of atherosclerotic, metabolic and hypertensive diseases: a review. *J Sports Sci* 1996;**14**:201-18.
- 31 Rejeski WJ, Brawley LR, Shumaker SA. Physical activity and health-related quality of life. *Exerc.Sports Sci.Rev.* 1996;**24**:71-108.
- 32 Royal College of Physicians. *Medical aspects of exercise: benefits and risks*. London: Royal College of Physicians of London, 1991.
- 33 Hillsdon M, Thorogood M, Anstiss T, Morris J. Randomised controlled trials of physical activity promotion in free living populations: a review. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1995;**49**:448-53.
- 34 National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. *Physical activity and the environment* London: NICE, 2008. www.nice.org.uk/Guidance/PH8/QuickRefGuide/pdf/English