

WEST OF ENGLAND ROAD SAFETY PARTNERSHIP (3RD MEETING)

**MONDAY 12th NOVEMBER 2007 at 2.00 pm – COUNCIL CHAMBER,
THORNBURY**

Partners Present:

Cllr Brian Allinson (SGC), Andy Colgan (AFRS), Cllr Ap Rees (NS), Cllr Mark Bradshaw(BCC), Cllr Charles Gerrish (B&NES), Norman Pascal (A&S Constabulary), James White((WoE Partnership), Malcolm Wilkinson (Highways Agency),

Officers present:

Derek Baillie(SGC), Adrian Clarke (B&NES), Frank Cox (NS), Alan Hale (SGC), Rob Joyce (SGC), Colin Knight (BCC) , John Painter (NS), John Roy (BCC), Chris Studley (SGC),

Apologies: Dick Bowen (Safecam), Paul Carpenter (H.M. Court Service), Peter Rowntree (B&NES)

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR

RESOLVED: That Cllr Brian Allinson be elected Chair of the meeting.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

As this was the first meeting of the Partnership since the last local government elections, all those attending introduced themselves and were welcomed to the meeting.

3. EVACUATION PROCEDURES

The Chair read out the evacuation procedures.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

There were none.

5. NOTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING ON 3RD APRIL 2007

RESOLVED: That the notes be approved.

6. PRESENTATION OF UCL & SRA REPORT (HEATHER WARD AND KRIS BEURET)

The Chair welcomed Heather Ward and Kris Beuret from University College London/Social Research Associates, the consultants appointed to review the effectiveness of speed camera operation. They tabled a report on the outcome of Phase 1 of their study and gave a presentation on it.

The following points emerged in relation to camera enforcement:

1. Cameras are only a *part* of a tool kit of other initiatives seeking to reduce road casualties (along with engineering and ETP strategies)
2. Fixed cameras are more efficient than mobile cameras as they can be in use 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.
3. Rural cameras are more effective than urban cameras
4. Effectiveness of mobile cameras can be improved by longer hours (into the hours of darkness) and by reducing the predictability of their siting (as per the Australian model)
5. There is a need to review the siting of fixed cameras to ensure they are actually reducing casualties rather than simply reducing speed. . Of particular need of review were the pre 2002 cameras (25% of all cameras the West of England area) where the reasoning for the siting was no longer tenable.
6. There was a need to refocus on possibly fewer sites and more enforcement at each.

The following points emerged in relation to Education, Training and Publicity:

8. The Partnership was working well especially in view of the fact that it was a very new organisation, but the liaison between the engineers and ETP reflected the physical siting of their offices rather than any reasoned relationship. In particular there was a need for a greater liaison between partners in WoERSP and other stakeholders including Safecam and the Dept of Transport and the quality of the information shared needed to be improved so that speed was not the only focus of attention.
9. The consultants had commented that much more analysis of road accidents needed to be undertaken in order to make better use of cameras, eg post codes of drivers involved, the type of vehicles, the socio-economic makeup of those areas where victims/ drivers lived. This enhanced analysis should be used to target road safety ETP programmes at particular geographical areas and user groups and to link this with national road safety targets.
10. ETP officers and engineers need to work as team rather than as separate entities. There was a need to consider appropriate training for RSO's.

The following points were made following questioning of the consultants:

11. In relation to the siting of cameras near vehicle activated speed warning signs – the consultants were of the view that if a backup was needed by a

camera, then the camera or sign was likely to be sited at the wrong place.

12. the psychology of engineering design had to be considered – eg, by deliberately restricting sight lines

13. many cities had traffic calmed areas and fast ring roads – pedestrians did not always appreciate the changes across an area - there was a good case for reducing speeds much further away from main routes and combining this with much greater enforcement.

14. not all cameras were equally effective, eg road casualty figures were already declining at many pre 2002 camera sites so there were dangers in overestimating the effectiveness of some cameras.

15. In response to the consultants' suggestion that engineers and RSO's should work more closely as a team, the consultants suggested that it would be useful for those officers involved to organise an away day, which would allow networking to take place, to look at best practice, to possibly allay misunderstandings of the officer roles. Such an away day could usefully involve representation from the PCT, Fire Service and the Police.

7. CASUALTY DATA REPORT (CHAIR OF DATA & ENGINEERING GROUP – JOHN PAINTER)

John reported the latest casualty figures for the Partnership. The Partnership was on target to achieve the 2010 national casualty reduction target.

In response to partner questions the following was noted:

Classification of the severity of injuries is based on the police records. The police representative commented that this was just one of the many tasks that the police officers attending accidents have to deal with and agreed that the figures could sometimes be misleading. Heather Ward added that, nationally, the under reporting of serious casualties was dropping faster than fatalities. The number of serious casualties was not dropping, though the number of less serious injuries was reducing.

The officer reported that the casualty reduction targets took no account of the increasing number of cyclists. There appeared to be no seasonality to the figures.

Councillors made the point that local authorities funding was affected if they did not meet their ksi reduction targets, so that information on the increasing numbers of motor cyclists and cyclists in the Partnership area would be very useful as a mitigating factor. The police representative commented that the PCT had local figures for accidents involving motorcyclists and the DVLA had overall motor cycle statistics (**ACTION:John Painter to provide these figures to the next meeting**)

RESOLVED:

1. That John Painter provide the next meeting with motor cycle accident and ownership statistics

2. That resources available to the Road Safety Partnership continue to be focussed on trying to achieve further reductions in casualties in the following user groups:

- Car occupant casualties in all areas
- Motorcyclist casualties in all areas
- Pedestrian casualties in Bristol
- Child pedestrian casualties in Bristol
- Cyclist casualties in Bristol.

3. That the 2007 casualty totals, when available, be used to reassess key user groups to be targeted in future years.

8. ROAD SAFETY EDUCATION, TRAINING AND PUBLICITY PROGRESS (CHAIR OF ETP GROUP – ALAN HALE)

Alan presented details of the current ETP situation across the Partnership.

He reported that ETP and Road Safety officer staffing levels varied across the partnership area and how they dealt with ETP also varied widely. However, they would welcome the opportunity to work with their engineering and other stakeholders on issues surrounding the use of cameras.

Mention was made of the large number of private schools in the Partnership area and the need for them to be aware of the services relating to road safety which local authorities could provide.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

9. FINANCE REPORT (JOHN ROY)

Partners were reminded that the rules regarding allocation of funding for speed camera enforcement had changed as of the 1st April 2007. Prior to that date the money had been allocated by government directly to the Safety Camera partnerships. As of the 1st April 2007 the money had been allocated directly to local authorities for their use to achieve the greatest reduction in casualty numbers rather than directly for focus on speed enforcement. The Partnership for the financial year 07/08 had decided to continue with a level of speed enforcement, provided by SAFECAM, commensurate with previous years and had awarded funds accordingly.

Details of indicative funding for 2008/9 were reported together with their implications.

CLr Ap Rees commented that SAFECAM be asked to consider the implications of increasing the number of drivers on the Speed Choice initiatives possible incorporating higher speed drivers.

RESOLVED:

1. That The Partnership note the indicative allocation of funding as detailed in this report and that officers of the four unitary authorities bring to the March meeting of "The Partnership" a detailed spending plan for the financial year 2008/09.

2. That SAFECAM be notified that its funding allocation for 2008/09 is likely to change from that which they received in 07/08 with their operations being focussed more specifically on achieving casualty reduction.

4. If the indicative levels of funding as reported earlier are forthcoming this will result in reductions in revenue and capital funding for SAFECAM of £68,351 and £15,208 respectively. In addition to these reductions changes in funding may result from North Somerset Council who have indicated that, unless SAFECAM substantially reduces its operating costs, it will withdraw funding from SAFECAM for 2008/09. The other local authorities, informed by the UCL/SRA study, may wish to re-focus camera enforcement activities to optimise casualty reduction. These changes may lead to further reductions in revenue funding for SAFECAM of as much as £400,000. It is therefore proposed that That SAFECAM be asked to advise The Partnership as soon as possible of the level of service that it can provide and the impact on their service of three potential levels of funding reduction as follows:
 - i) £63,351 reduction in revenue and £15,208 reduction in capital;
 - ii) As (i) above with a further reduction in revenue of £200,000;
 - iii) As (i) above with a further reduction in revenue of £400,000.

5. That the Policy and Delivery Group of The Partnership be asked to bring forward recommendations to the March meeting of "The Partnership" as to how the projected funding from Speed Choice of £200,000 for 2008/09 be allocated to support "The Partnerships" road safety work programme for 2008/09.

6. That a review of Speed Choice , to consider the increasing range of the scheme, will be reported to the March executive meeting of the partnership

10. WEST OF ENGLAND ROAD SAFETY PARTNERSHIP AND SAFECAM – MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AND PROTOCOL (DEREK BAILLIE)

Derek advised the Partnership that the following three policy documents were being prepared and would be submitted for approval by the Partnership at its next meeting:

- Partnership Framework Structure Diagram – the copy attached to the meeting papers had been agreed by relevant Officers, subject to further consultation with other members of the former Safety Camera Governance Board;

- Memorandum of Understanding/ Service Level Agreement – this was being drafted by the Police, for signature by all members of the WoE Road Safety Partnership, and would set out the basis for the working arrangements for Safecam. The SLA would not be legally binding but would provide a solid foundation for future working.

- Safecam Operational Policies and Protocol – to set out policies and methods for deployment of safety cameras.

RESOLVED: that the report be noted.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was none.

12. DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETINGS:

RESLOVED:

1. That the next meeting be hosted by North Somerset Council at a venue to be confirmed on 25th March 2008 at 2.00 pm
2. That Bristol City Council host and service the September 2008 meeting.

The meeting ended at 3.55pm.

CHAIR: