

ROAD SAFETY MEMBER LED REVIEW – CABINET RESPONSE

To: Cabinet

Date: 18th December 2012

From: Executive Director : Economy, Transport & Environment (ETE)

Electoral division(s): All

Forward Plan ref: Not applicable **Key decision:** No

Purpose: Cabinet is asked to consider the response to the Joint Overview and Scrutiny review into the 2011 Road Safety Service restructure.

Recommendation: Cabinet is recommended to:

- a) Thank the Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the work in relation to the review.
- b) Support a review of the road safety strategy.
- c) Support the ongoing review and refresh the Road Safety Partnership.
- d) Support the concept of continuing the move to project based delivery and funding of targeted interventions.
- e) Support the provision of appropriate resources to evaluate opportunities for future income generation, including developing business plans and tender documents as appropriate.

Officer contact:		Member contact	
Name:	Amanda Mays	Name:	Councillor Tony Orgee
Post:	Road safety manager.	Portfolio:	Community Infrastructure
Email:	Amanda.mays@cambridgeshire.gov.uk	Email:	Tony.orgee.cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Tel:	01223 715923	Tel:	01223 699173

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Council's budget setting for 2011/12 included savings from the road safety budget. A restructure proposal was issued during September 2011, and the resulting staffing changes were implemented in March 2012.
- 1.2 A Joint Scrutiny Review was established to examine the potential implications of the proposed changes. The review group comprised Councillors Tariq Sadiq (Chairman), Ralph Butcher, Peter Reeve and Richard West.
- 1.3 The findings of this group were presented at Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 5th October 2012.
- 1.4 The O&S review took place during the period during which the new structure of the road safety service was implemented, and the new team was being built up. This will have had an influence on the findings of the panel.

2. MAIN ISSUES

- 2.1 This report sets out a proposed response to the findings and recommendations set out in the Overview & Scrutiny report. Where progress against individual recommendations has already been made this is highlighted in the table below.
- 2.2 One of the primary issues highlighted in the helpful Overview and Scrutiny report is the perceived lack of direction within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership (CPRSP). Over the last 2 years there have been many changes in staff, board level representatives, and structures within almost all of the participating organisations. This has certainly had an impact on the effectiveness of the partnership. However the partnership board meetings have been reinstated with high level membership from all partners, including the County Cabinet member for Community Infrastructure and the Service Director. The board are reviewing priorities in light of the importance being placed upon road safety by the Shadow Health and Well Being Board.
- 2.3 There is always much that we can learn from good practice elsewhere. There has been a lot of good work in areas such as Lincolnshire, Gloucestershire, South Yorkshire and Essex. The next steps in the rejuvenation of CPRSP should include sharing advice and experience with high performing partnerships. However it should not be forgotten that Cambridgeshire has seen a sustained reduction in road traffic casualty numbers over the last 2 or 3 decades and the trend is continuing with ever fewer people killed or seriously hurt on Cambridgeshire Roads, as illustrated in the table below.

KSI casualties in Cambridgeshire 12 month rolling total.



2.4 The scrutiny panel report contains 18 recommendations: whilst some of these could be taken on board at least to some extent within the existing available resources and budget, most require additional support, funding or resources.

2.5 The following table contains the suggested response to each of the review's recommendations.

Theme	Recommendation	Response
Strategy	1) An explicit objective within the strategy should be to focus education interventions on areas / schools where there is most need, in order to maximise the value of limited resources	1) Partly Accepted: Road Safety interventions are already targeted at higher risk groups identified from evidence and analysis. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership Board (CPRSP) validate these for all of the organisations within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Road Safety Partnership.
Restructure Process	2) The Council should ensure partners are consulted in future about staffing changes that affect the partnership.	2) Accepted. In future where significant staffing changes that have an impact on partnership working are planned, partner organisations will be kept more involved in the consultation process.
Restructure Rationale	3) Increase in Education resource is required (funded by implementation of other recommendations listed below).	3) Partly Accepted The restructure significantly reduced the permanent staff resource in both education and engineering. Whilst it is not proposed to reintroduce permanent posts into the structure, opportunities for specific project funding will be sought. Where we are successful additional resource may be funded on a project specific basis. For example funding was secured to deliver a new child pedestrian training project across county primary schools, which included the cost of a 2 year part time assistant road safety officer. This post was set up in August 2012. Options for other possible projects such as targeted motorcycling work and child scooter training in schools are being investigated for future funding bids.
Partnership Working	4) The partnership should be reset – with new terms of reference and a clear action plan with identified lead 'owners' for each key action.	4) Accepted. This is already in hand. A CPRSP board meeting was held on 4 th October 2012. Partners remain very positive about reviewing and moving forward with the

Theme	Recommendation	Response
	<p>5) A lead officer should be appointed with responsibility for leading the partnership as a whole.</p> <p>6) An officer should be appointed to provide coordination support for the partnership.</p> <p>7) Schools should be represented on the partnership.</p>	<p>partnership. A revised draft Terms of Reference (ToR) and partnership priorities will be produced in winter 2012/13. Sharing good practice with partnerships such as South Yorkshire, Gloucestershire and Lincolnshire who have managed to maintain high performance during challenging times is something we will pursue to help inform the refresh of CPRSP.</p> <p>5) Not Accepted. Responsibility for leading the partnership as a whole is already enshrined within the remit of the Director of Infrastructure, Management and Operations.</p> <p>6) Partly accepted. Funding pressures mean that we have to make the most of our resources. Working more flexibly and enshrining the importance of effective partnership working is one of the key aims of the current transformation project for ETE. However discussions will continue with partners to explore potential for joint funding of resource for the partnership</p> <p>7) Accepted Inclusion of a schools representative will be investigated.</p>
<p>Schools and Colleges</p>	<p>8) The partnership should develop an improved education package for use in schools.</p> <p>9) Resources should be targeted on the basis of evidence based need in schools. This will need to take into account work to promote safer routes to schools, deprivation and road traffic accident data so that interventions have the greatest effect.</p>	<p>8) Partly Accepted. A range of resources, training and support is already available to schools. Further development of this package to fit current resource levels and school needs will be considered by CPRSP.</p> <p>9) Partly accepted. There is scope to make smarter use of some of the data. Targeting difficult to reach groups is something we always strive to do, especially where they are identified through the CPRSP key themes. However targeting very small groups can require a high financial investment which can leave other larger groups</p>

Theme	Recommendation	Response
	<p>10) Consideration should be given to incorporating elements of driver awareness courses within educational initiatives.</p> <p>11) A governor within each school could be given a road safety role to raise the profile of the issue.</p> <p>12) Young drivers often find that insurance is prohibitively costly. The Council should investigate the possibility of securing a more favourable arrangement with insurance providers, with the proviso that drivers undertake road safety education related initiatives.</p>	<p>disadvantaged. In some cases difficult choices have to be made about the best use of resource.</p> <p>10) Partly accepted. Using sound evidence of effectiveness is important to ensure interventions are not counterproductive. Research shows that hard hitting education is not appropriate for all audiences.</p> <p>We work with national experts to develop effective training. For example our latest young driver training is being developed working closely with the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) to be delivered in further education colleges.</p> <p>11) Partly Accepted We would encourage this, but this is a matter for each school governing body.</p> <p>12) Not Accepted There are already several schemes nationally whereby young drivers get reduced premiums by undertaken post test training, or committing to using “black box” monitoring. Building on these initiatives further is already subject to in depth investigation at national level by insurers and road safety professionals. Cambridgeshire is happy to feed into these wider studies, but there would be little leverage behind any local negotiations divorced from the national efforts.</p>
<p>(Note recommendation 13 is not for Cabinet and so is not referenced in this document).</p>		
<p>Localism</p>	<p>14) The Council's policy should be amended so that safety cameras can be introduced if local communities express their desire to have one and are willing to pay all associated costs and liabilities.</p>	<p>14) Not accepted. Existing policy does not preclude communities paying for the installation and running costs of cameras. Such proposals can be considered subject to an evaluation of need, and potential effectiveness. Assessment would need to take into account compliance with relevant legislation, and in liaison with the police.</p>

Theme	Recommendation	Response
		<p>Operations and enforcement of camera sites is carried out by Cambridgeshire police, supported by Her majesty's Court Service. They would need to look at whether enforcement of a new site could be undertaken within their existing resource levels. It is unlikely that a site not selected on casualty reduction grounds would justify increasing resource.</p>
<p>Performance Measurement</p>	<p>15) Changes in key performance indicators in areas where there have been intensive educational initiatives should be tracked in order to determine their efficacy.</p> <p>16) Comparisons with statistical neighbours should be introduced.</p>	<p>15) Not accepted. There are currently no KPIs for educational interventions, and all national indicators have been removed. In the absence of national targets, however, Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC) has set its own local road safety targets in Challenge 6 of LTP3.</p> <p>16) Accepted. We will work with the County information officers to determine which counties might have a "statistical neighbour profile" with Cambridgeshire, and whether comparison might bring valuable insight.</p>
<p>Funding</p>	<p>17) Council road safety courses should be optimised so that they can win Police contracts in the future.</p>	<p>17) Accepted. We are currently looking at various changes to increase the efficiency of the management of course already delivered by CCC. For example using the contact centre to provide more consistent phone cover for bookings and payments. Winning additional work in this field has the potential to bring in revenue but we would need to invest in the business and the tendering process to develop a bid with any chance of winning the work against private sector competition.</p> <p>Increasing the training operation to by up to 30times current numbers also brings an increased level of risk which would need to be evaluated.</p> <p>We are currently exploring the possibilities of a collaborative bid with</p>

Theme	Recommendation	Response
		other authorities within the 3 forces collaboration area to increase our changes of a successful bid and reduce the risk.
Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership	<p>18) The Council should learn from the experiences of Lincolnshire.</p> <p>19) A franchise, or shared service arrangement should be explored (if implemented the partnership recommendations would change accordingly).</p>	<p>18) Accepted. Lincolnshire Partnership has an excellent and mature operating model, as do the South Yorkshire Safer Road Partnership and the Gloucestershire Partnership. We already work with colleagues in these areas on specific projects and would relish the prospect of further increasing our exchange of ideas with them.</p> <p>19) Accepted. There is much good practice in other partnerships. We already tap into specialist skills from other authorities, for example we are currently working with Lincolnshire to build a crash simulator car. This is something that Lincolnshire have been operating with great success for several years to engage with a young driver audience. We will continue to explore ways to work with other authorities to deliver effective, well proven interventions.</p>

3. ALIGNMENT WITH PRIORITIES AND WAYS OF WORKING

3.1 Developing the local economy for the benefit of all

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- Minimising the number of traffic collisions is beneficial to the economy.
 - Road accidents impact negatively on businesses by creating congestion, affecting journey and deliver times.
 - Having staff or vehicles involved in crashes costs businesses directly in terms of repairing or replacing vehicles, injuries to employees and the associated costs, and indirectly in terms of increased insurance premiums and damage to reputation. CCC encourage and support employers to find appropriate road safety training for staff.

3.2 Helping people live healthy and independent lives

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- The primary aim of road safety education is to reduce the risk of people being involved in crashes. The lives of road casualties are very directly impacted. 70% of serious trauma cases result from road traffic collisions.
- Road safety education also benefits people health by encouraging and helping people to choose healthy alternatives such as cycling and walking, and to do that safely.

3.3 Supporting and protecting vulnerable people

The following bullet points set out details of implications identified by officers:

- One of the key focuses of our work is keeping children safe on the roads.
- An effective road safety service also provides support and advice for older road users, and people with physical or mental impairments that often bring extra challenges in negotiating the streets safely.

4. SIGNIFICANT IMPLICATIONS

4.1 Resource and Performance Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- In order to the recommendations in the Overview and Scrutiny Panel report additional resource will required. This could be in the form of permanent staff, fixed term project staff, temporary secondments or external staff or services as appropriate.

4.2 Statutory, Risk and Legal Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- The 1988 Road Traffic Act, Section 39, puts a Statutory Duty on the local authority to undertake studies into road accidents, and to take steps both to reduce and prevent accidents. The wording of the Act is:
 - **39. (1)** *“The Secretary of State may, with the approval of the Treasury, provide for promoting road safety by disseminating information or advice relating to the use of roads.”*
 - **39. (2)** *“Each local authority must prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety and may make contributions towards the cost of measures for promoting road safety taken by other authorities or bodies.”*

4.3 Equality and Diversity Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- Targeting road safety work at groups where people are disadvantaged or at higher risk of injury is central to the recommendations.

4.4 Engagement and Consultation Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- Engagement with communities, individuals and in particular hard to reach groups is central to the recommendations.

4.5 Public Health Implications

The following bullet points set out details of significant implications identified by officers:

- Road safety interventions have a direct impact on injuries and death. Road traffic casualties are particularly highly represented in cases of major trauma (around 70% of major trauma cases relate to road crashes reference *NHS Midlands and East Specialist Commissioning Group webpages*)

Source Documents	Location
<p>Road Safety Member Led Review Report As presented at Enterprise, Growth and Community Infrastructure Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 05 October 2012</p> <p>NHS Midlands and East Specialist Commissioning Group webpages</p>	<p>http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/CMSWebsite/Apps/Committees/Meeting.aspx?meetingID=559</p> <p>http://www.eoescg.nhs.uk/Services/MajorTrauma/Prevention/Preventingseriousinjury.aspx</p>