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Review of Safer Roads Humber Partnership: Transparency, governance and performance monitoring

Background

We have reviewed the activities, financing and governance of the Safer Roads Humberside partnership.

Members of the Partnership are:

- Humberside Police
- East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC)
- North East Lincolnshire Council
- North Lincolnshire Council City of Hull Council
- Highways England,
- Humberside Fire and Rescue Service
- Her Majesty’s Court Service
- Defence School of Transport
- Lincolnshire/Nottingham Air Ambulance

The Partnership is governed through the Safer Roads Humber (SRH) Policy Board comprising senior representatives from the first six organisations on this list and funded from income from a proportion of the fees paid by drivers committing a low level speeding offence who have been diverted to the SRH run National Speed Awareness Course.

SRH’s overall aim is, through effective partnership working, to reduce the number of people killed or injured on the partnership’s roads. It does this through:

- Enforcement at core safety camera sites and sites of community concern
- Monitoring and publicising performance of core safety camera sites and the Partnership’s activities
- Management and delivery of Humberside Police’s driver/rider education, or diversionary, schemes.
- Development and delivery of intelligence led casualty reduction campaigns that may include enforcement, education and communication elements e.g. iCar, drink drive campaign etc.
- Supporting and enhancing the Contributing Partners’ individual casualty reduction strategies
**Recommended Actions for implementation now.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Governance</strong></th>
<th>Policy Board Chair to action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance has been weak in the past. Put in place structures and strategies to strengthen transparency, accountability and financial control.</td>
<td>Partnership Manager to draft with input from Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An updated Service Level Agreement is needed to reflect range of Partners and new self financing model</td>
<td>Policy Board Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Policy Board Terms of Reference could be strengthened to make it clearer that it has responsibilities to the Working Group and a communications role between SRH and partners’ elected members.</td>
<td>Policy Board to discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRH’s internal reporting mechanisms are very good but its engagement with the elected members of its partner organisations is poor and needs to be improved so that they are informed as to how the Partnership is funded and operates.</td>
<td>Policy Board to discuss and adopt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss alternative models of reporting and governance used by other safety camera partnerships and adopt which is best suited to Safer Roads Humber.</td>
<td>Partnership Manager to discuss with Policy Board and action digital manager to set up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Partners and elected members password protected section of website could provide a closed forum for publication of finance and minutes</td>
<td>Policy Board to support and Working Group to develop fully costed forward programme for agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to the Working Group in its good work in implementing an evidence based programme of work to change driver, rider and road user behaviour.</td>
<td>Working Group to report to Board and then to public via website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor and report on effectiveness of road safety programmes through appropriate intermediate indicators which have demonstrated links to casualty reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Management</strong></th>
<th>Policy Board to draw up job and person specifications and ensure the appointment is made without further delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A new Partnership Manager should be appointed. It is important for the functioning of the Partnership that the manager has a strong skills set which includes programme management and road safety knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>ERYC to continue to act as treasurers and lead discussion with Policy Board on a regular basis how financial risks might change and be managed associated with the Partnership becoming self-funding. Scenario planning on a ‘what-if’ basis for different trends in income and expenditure under different assumptions relating to the operation of the safety camera programme locally and nationally is a helpful aid to these discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The financial arrangements are complex and the highest public service standards are employed in their management through senior finance officers at ERYC acting as treasurers. The Partnership needs to be aware of the volatility of its income stream which is in part due to the unpredictability of the amount of funding that comes back to or goes from the Partnership via the National Driver Offenders Scheme (NDORS) in respect of drivers taking speed awareness courses in places where they were not detected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation of enforcement of speeds by safety cameras</th>
<th>SRH through the Working Group is, and should remain, part of this process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A protocol for site selection is in use. It was developed nationally and is in use by many road safety partnerships. It is in need of updating and discussions are taking place nationally and regionally to develop new guidance. A full review¹ should be commissioned of the performance of the safety cameras operated by the Partnership and presented to the Board, the Working Group and the individual local authorities to help them make decisions as to the shape of the programme going forward. The public should be informed through the website A Partnership wide speed management strategy should be developed which dovetails with those being developed by the individual partners. It should include the required actions to change behaviour such as awareness campaigns, training, road engineering and an enforcement plan.</td>
<td>Partnership Manager with input from Data Analyst Partnership Manager and Working Group in consultation with Highway Authority Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication with the public</th>
<th>Working Group reporting to Policy Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Partnership should develop a public communication strategy which is regularly updated The website is poor and out of date. It should become independent from ERYC and a part</td>
<td>Partnership Manager in agreement with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ See for example the method given by the RAC Foundation in http://www.racfoundation.org/research/safety/speed-camera-data-report
time digital manager be appointed on a contract basis paid for by SRH funds (this is common in this area of work) to redesign and keep up to date the content. The presentation of information and data needs a more modern approach following guidelines for presenting data to lay audiences. Other Partnerships' websites provide good models for layout and content. Communication by social media should be considered and kept up to date on a daily basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group and Policy Board</th>
<th>Media and Marketing Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 1. Fact finding regarding governance, management, financial structures and reporting

#### 1.1 How does the Partnership function?

This part of the review covered the following questions about the partnership:

- Whether the overarching delivery mechanisms were effective in terms of key indicators of partnership working such as clarity of roles and responsibilities; sharing of resources and data, commitment, communication and leadership?
- How integrated are approaches to specific problems and do agencies share sources such as knowledge, funding and skills in the delivery of road safety?
- What opportunities were there for delivery agencies to share experiences, learn from each other and avoid duplication of effort?; and
- What are the skills gaps and how are these dealt with?

**Headline judgement**

*The review has found that the multi-agency partnership comprised highly committed members that have a common purpose and shared objectives who work effectively together and continually strive to improve road safety for the people of Humberside. Areas to work on include clarifying the leadership function of the Policy Board and finding ways to engage with the community and elected members so that they realise the breadth of the work the partnership does outside of speed enforcement such the educational work of the fire and rescue teams in schools.*

**What did this part of the review cover?**

This part of the review spoke to nine members of the partnership – five from the Policy Board and four from the Working Group. The interviews lasted around 30 minutes and

---

explored their views of the effectiveness of Safer Roads Humber partnership as a casualty reduction delivery mechanism. The review process involved judging whether the partnership is working in a way that is either “very effective”, “quite effective”, “not very effective” or “not effective at all” in relation to key indicators of partnership working such as clear roles and responsibilities; sharing of data and resources, clear communication channels, level of commitment and leadership. Verbatim quotes are used to illustrate the findings of the review. The interviewee’s quotes are anonymous, but are identified using A-I with an indication of whether they were part of the Policy Board (PB) or Working Group (WG).

Views of partnership members

1. Clarity of roles and responsibilities: quite effective

Generally, SRH was regarded as being professional, well structured, well-funded, well organised and managed: “The meeting is always very professional. Governance appears very strong and the people who support and advise the group whether it is from a financial position or … from the police, all those people are very professional and give me comfort when I am there representing local authority that the business of the group is managed very professionally. That’s one of the things that certainly struck me when I’ve attended meetings.” (Participant I, PB).

However, there were mixed views about the respective roles of the Policy Board and Working Group. For some the Policy Board was seen as having more of an oversight and scrutiny function than one of giving strategic direction. One participant felt that the strategic direction role of the Policy Board had been weak and had drifted prior to the new Chairs appointment: “I would say there wasn’t an awful lot of direction. I think the Board – they made decisions if things were put in front of them, but I think what was happening was that the Working Group were actually coming up with all of the ideas and the initiatives and things, and then the Board were actually saying yes or no rather than the Board saying, ‘We want you to go away and concentrate on x’, and we say, ‘Right yes okay we’ll go away and come back to you with our proposals.’ It was very much being said from the bottom of rather than the other way around if you get what I mean?” (Participant F, PB). The perceived weakness of the board was in parts attributed to that fact that they felt they did not need to set the strategic priorities of SRH because of the strong role of the Working Group. Priorities were described as being identified by the Working Group in a ‘bottom up process’. It was felt by one participant that the Policy Board was a ‘rubber stamping’ group: “it didn’t really set the direction because the direction was there and everyone knew what they were doing” (Participant A, WG). Another participant felt that the Policy Board was there to manage the business: “For me, the policy board is ensuring that Safer Roads Humber is working to budget, staying within budget, being prepared for any changes there could be, making sure that adequate risk is covered, making sure through overseeing what is being suggested, through the various papers, that it is all working properly…..For me, the Working Group is delivery, of ensuring that the message is getting across. There are two distinct parts of Safer Roads for me. There is the enforcement part and there is the education part/engineering part, which the Working Group is important to deliver”. (Participant D, PB)

The Working Group was seen as having a strong role in the coordination of the different partnerships situated in individual local authorities and in “making sure that everyone’s pulling in the same direction”. Therefore the work of SRH complemented local activities: “By looking at working together, identifying cross boundary, you know initiatives that will benefit the whole of the Humber areas. So I think for me the Working Group is complementary to what each local authority’s individual responsibilities (Participant B, PB). In this sense SRH provided an overarching mechanism for delivery and also ensured that there was no duplication of effort: “The Working Group allows us to make sure that we’re not duplicating work, make sure that we are able to support each other when necessary. We’re able to have
a good understanding of the campaigns that [name] runs both regionally and the campaigns that we support nationally. It’s just a really good kind of… It’s a really good group for sharing ideas, developing new initiatives that we’ve run in the past, and working to be able to do that really.” (Participant C, WG).

The Working Group also arranged sub-groups to look into specific safety issues. For example, concern was expressed about how to reach out to the Eastern European community and this led to involving the chaplaincy and the Catholic Church and to developing resources for them.

In addition the move to a self-financing model meant that more partners (local authorities) in the Humberside area ‘got a seat at the table’ which further strengthened the partnership: “Hull hadn’t been able to contribute for quite a number of years and North East Lincolnshire just said that they couldn’t. So we’re just in the process of kind of bringing them back in. though although East Riding and North Lincolnshire are very proactive locally and as well as at Working Group level there’s some pieces of work to do in Hull and North East Lincolnshire to be able to get to where the other two are.” (Participant C, WG).

2. Sharing of data and resources: very effective

Participants testified to the openness of sharing data and resources. In particular the police intelligence was regarded as invaluable in identifying emergent problems and target audiences and messages for campaigns: “We have always found in addition to openness, if there was any additional information that were required, particularly intelligence. That has always been very useful, particularly in being able to identify areas where there are problems, and the type of offender as it were. One of the big problems that we have within the city is accidents with pedestrians and powered two wheelers and so it assists with our accident investigation, to see what the trends are and to see where difficulties are.” (Participant D, WG).

The Partnership enabled the provision of resources to fund education initiatives where many other partnerships, experiencing significant cuts, could not fund such activities: “I really value the work that we do with and through, Safer Roads Humber. Particularly over the last few years as everybody has suffered cutbacks. The fact that we have been able to co-ordinate and combine resources has been vital, to make sure that we have been able to see our casualty numbers continue to decrease. I take a degree of pride, comfort, satisfaction, in the fact that in the Humberside area, in my local authority, we have continued to put a resource both financially, and staff, and time, into road safety and casualty reduction. And we have continued to see success. And that is what I am here for.” (Participant I, PB)

The Partnership has also funded enforcement campaigns that may not have been funded otherwise by the police: “I think it’s a really good model because we get quite a lot out of it. It’s quite a well-funded model, I would say. I know that, as a force, we get an awful lot of overtime funding for different projects. You know, we go to Safer Roads with an idea and they will fund it to a greater extent, whereas as a force, with the structures we have and the limits on funding we’re facing with austerity, maybe wouldn’t be able to run some of the campaigns that we have.” (Participant A, WG). It also funded tools for enforcement such as purchasing drug detection wipes to address the drug drive problem.

The Partnership has also been able to deliver educational activities within a young person strategy across the Humberside by resourcing fire and rescue staff to work with schools – an area where local authority staff struggle to gain access: “So it worked very well. We have managed to get into places that we previously could not get into, by working in partnership with another organisation that is better placed to open doors, I am not quite sure, but certainly have found it easier to get in.” (Participant H, WG)
3. Communication: very effective

All members felt there was a high level of communication between partners and were well informed about the activities of the Partnership. There are quarterly Policy Board meetings which are minuted and frequent communication between members via, emails, agenda write ups, and more local meetings. Much of the work of SRH is also cascaded down to local safer roads partnerships. Participants felt that they had a good understanding of what each partner was doing, what needed to be discussed and the financial position of the board which they felt was presented in a way that is logical, understandable and timely.

4. Community engagement: quite effective

The Partnership has a number of ways of engaging with the community in terms of campaigns, website and social media but members generally felt that there could be greater communication about what the actual Partnership does. They reported that the councils were seen as the main contact for people to make complaints about speeding which are then followed up to ascertain whether there are casualty problems and/or speeding issues. Participants felt it was hard to please the public regarding their enforcement role, “I mean, we get some complaints from people who have been caught, but we get far more complaints about speeding. And in fact when you look at them, a great number of those complaints about speeding, people are not actually speeding. They may be going faster than people want them to, but they are not necessarily exceeding the speed limit.” (Participant H, WG).

Participants reported that outside of campaigns and educational activities involving the public their main contact with the public was via elected members. Some partners felt it was a challenge to effectively engage with elected members over the nature of partnerships ‘surplus’ : “I think the only issue there is at the moment with some members is the fact that there is a surplus, whereas the surplus is there because of the risk that the Partnership has got and also for replacement, so for me, it is good accountancy, that you are covering your risk, because if you can’t manage your risk out, and your risk is financial, you need to be able to, if the worst comes to the worst, be able to pay off what your risk is, otherwise the Partnership could end up coming back to the partners, asking for finance, which is what we haven’t got.” (Participant D, PB).

The Policy Board is currently developing a speed management strategy to assist elected members, and assure elected members that the Partnership is dealing with speed problems in systematic way to reassure the public and only enforce if a problem is identified. In addition, one participant of the Working Group suggested having a sub group on community engagement might help in working out how best to engage with them.

5. Commitment: very effective

A high level of commitment to the Partnership was shown by all participants.

6. Leadership: very effective

It was generally felt that leadership was collaborative because of the strong shared objectives of the partners. Leadership was seen as residing with the police because of their role as data providers, enforcers and business managers: “So it is only right that the police have the majority of the leadership. But everybody is involved in the direction. Nationally, I think the police probably are fed more information that impacts upon road safety. Whether that be enforcement, education or engineering. And we all bring our national influences into that environment anyway.” (Participant E, PB).
1.2 Review Governance, management and financial structures

How this part of the review was undertaken.

Minutes of Board meetings, financial reporting, Terms of Reference for the Policy Board and Working Group, and the Service Level Agreement (SLA) were reviewed. Three other partnerships were contacted for their Governance arrangements.

Governance

The Partnership survey indicates that over recent time the Policy Board has become weak in its strategic leadership of the Partnership. It has not been sufficiently searching in its oversight of policy development or setting of performance indicators for success.

The Minutes of the quarterly meetings over the period 26 June 2014 to 23 June 2015 are sparse in their detail and often containing many apologies for absence. Whilst it is recognised that senior people are busy, the Governance of the Partnership is important. The regular attenders being Humberside Police, East Riding of Yorkshire and North Lincolnshire. The former two organisations hold management or financial management responsibilities. In September 2015 there was a new chair and the minutes represented the discussions and contained clear actions. Another new chair took over in January 2016 and the minutes again reflect more discussion and concrete actions. In both recent meetings there were fewer apologies.

The job of the Board is to provide a strategic direction for the Partnership and to ensure it is delivering its activities according to its plans. All the elements of this strategy are present or in development in the day to day work of the Partnership. Through the steer of the new Board Chair (2016) they are being brought together and formalised into policies and strategies with their associated indicators and reporting structures. This discipline is welcome by Board and Working Group alike.

The partnership survey indicated that the members feel the Governance structure work well. The review would not be complete without looking at other partnership and three others have been contacted (Surrey, Essex and Suffolk) and their Governance arrangements discussed.

There is no single governance structure for safety partnerships and whilst the three contacted have a strong county structure with smaller unitary authorities, the similarities of their models are worth consideration by the SRH Board:

- Chair by a current member of the Board with mechanism for reporting to elected members (Police currently in Humberside)
- Chair by Local Authority Cabinet Member for Transport (might need to rotate amongst LA Partners)
  - as above with Police and Crime Commissioner as a Board member
- Chair by Police and Crime Commissioner.
  - as above with Cabinet Member(s) as Board member(s)

Recommendations

Discuss alternative models of reporting and governance used by other safety camera partnerships and adopt which is best suited to Safer Roads Humber. Three examples from other Partnerships are given for information.
A Partners and elected members password protected section of website could provide a closed forum for publication of finance and minutes.

A Service Level Agreement or a Memorandum of Understanding?

Partnerships are not legal entities but a set of partners agreeing to work together toward a common aim. The Governance could be by either a Memorandum of Understanding or a more formal Service Level Agreement. Each of the three partnerships contacted by the reviewers has a Memorandum of Understanding. However, given the complexity of SRH’s financial arrangements (because it runs its own NSAC courses) a new Service Level Agreement is probably appropriate. It is important that it is clear about the division of funds, property and equipment between partners should the Partnership cease to exist. This arises because prior to the 2015/16 financial year partners made a financial contribution. Hull left only to re-join when the new funding model began.

Recommendation

Governance has not been strong enough in the past but the new chair is bringing in structures and strategies which will strengthen transparency, accountability and financial control. He should be given time to put these in place.

An updated Service Level Agreement is needed to reflect range of Partners and new self financing model

The Working Group is the engine house of the Partnership. Its membership comprises dedicated, enthusiastic and professional people from all nine member organisations. It develops programmes of activity according to intelligence and data about the road user and demographic groups most at risk of death and injury on the Partnerships’ roads. There is a strong partnership ethos and SRH works with and supports the work of the partner authorities.

The work of the Partnership has been demonstrated to be effective with casualty reductions year on year and the awarding of the prestigious Prince Michael Awards for Road Safety to two of its flagship projects.

Historically each year the Working Group has requested from the Policy Board a fixed sum of money to cover its casualty reduction activities. This has ranged from £100,000 to £200,000. Other models could be considered ranging from all funds for projects to be the subject of costed proposals to a two stage approach with a fixed sum for activities which recur each year and a further sum which is akin to a grant to be formally requested though a standard proposal system with rationale/beneficiaries, cost, benefits including how these will be assessed, and timescale for reporting back to the Board.

The second model seems to be better suited and it is understood that the Board has recently requested a structure such as this. A proposal form is being drafted for presentation to the Board for its agreement to be included in next year’s budget. This should not mean that less money is available for such important work.

It is difficult to establish cost effectiveness of an education and campaign programme in the conventional way of measuring reduction in casualties because the link is not immediate and strong as it is with enforcement and engineering implementations. The way effectiveness is measured is against intermediate indicators which have demonstrated links to casualty reduction such as change in speed, improvement in seat belt wearing, reduction in drivers over the breath limit, improvement in knowledge or skills etc.
The Working Group needs to set out clearly its intermediate indicators of success and continue to use the E-Valu-it toolkit for this. This has been developed by RoSPA with funding from the Department for Transport and is a tool to help Local Authorities and others measure which activities deliver best value in terms of getting the right road safety message across to the right people.

**Recommendation**

The Working Group should be allowed to get on with its good work and not be overburdened with bureaucracy. However, it should be conducting its business in a way which shows how it is spending its funding and it should continue to monitor the effectiveness of its programmes through appropriate intermediate indicators which have demonstrated links to casualty reduction.

The Working Group programme of activities and campaigns is not well known and should be promoted more to the public and other professionals via the website and social media.

**Terms of reference for Policy Board and Working Group**

The Terms of Reference of both the Policy Board and Working Group set out their shared Mission statement: *To reduce the number of people killed or seriously injured on our roads through effective partnership working.*

The intention of the Policy Board is: *To provide strategic direction, resources and support to the Safer Roads Working Group.*

This could be strengthened: *To provide strategic direction, oversight, resources and support to the Safer Roads Working Group.*

In its execution of its intention it lists 15 actions. It would benefit from strengthening to include:

- Ensure there are clear two way communication channels with elected members of partner organisations with regular updates on activities, actions and finance
- Receive and consider reports on Working Group proposals for funding and reporting
- Oversee the speed management strategy and ensure it is regularly updated
- Oversee the communications strategy and ensure it is regularly updated
- To receive and consider annual performance reports of Working Group activities

The structure proposes the Chair of the police Board be elected for 12 months. This is too short to put in place and monitor effective strategies and should be increased to somewhere between 3 and 5 years.

The intention of the Working Group is:

- To provide guidance, expertise and support to the Safer Roads Policy Board
- To research, consider and allocate financial support to road safety projects with in its remit and financial rules

The Working Group Terms of Reference are clear and set out its responsibilities and relationship with the Policy Board. But again the Chair could be in post for longer than one year for the reasons given above for the Policy Board.

---

Recommendation

The Policy Board Terms of Reference could be strengthened to make it clearer that it has responsibilities to the Working Group and a communications role between SRH and partners’ elected members.

Management

The Partnership has a full time manager paid for from its income. The current post holder has been acting manager since the previous manager retired. This is an important role and provides the link between the partners, between the Working Group and the Board and between the Partnership and the public.

The remit for the Partnership manager is on the website and this highlights the following:

- The Partnership manager has day-to-day responsibility for financial planning and accountability, operational management and the running of partnership activities
- Ensures all Partnership activities are intelligence-led, cost-effective and delivered on time and on budget.

Recommendation

It is important for the functioning of the Partnership that a new manager be appointed without further undue delay. The person needs a strong skills set which includes programme management and road safety knowledge.

Financial Structures

The financial structure is not straightforward owing to the different parties involved. The income derives to the Partnership from enforcement of speed limits by police officers using speed cameras. Drivers a little over the limit are offered, at the discretion of the Chief Constable, attendance on a speed awareness course instead of a fine and three points on their licence. High end speeders are either given a fixed penalty notice or a court summons and their fines are paid directly to the Government Treasury and do not go through the SRH accounts. In real terms SRH does not see any of these fees directly. They are paid by the drivers to the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC). This may seem odd. It occurs because the PCC is, by law, the recipient of all funding relating to policing and crime reduction no matter its source. The account is administered by the police treasurer on the PCC’s behalf. The finance and admin assistants at the Central Ticket Office (CTO) collate costs of operating the CTO broken down by its various activities. These are approved and internally transferred to the CTO to cover the costs. At the end of the year, or other suitable accounting period, the difference between the income and expenditure is transferred to the SRH fund at East Riding Yorkshire Council where its senior finance officers act as treasurers for SRH.

All accounts are subject to audit through their respective organisations – first the police then the EYRC. This acts as a check on the financial controls. As Treasurers to SRH the ERYC finance officers are responsible for drawing up the budget and providing the financial breakdown for the Policy Board meetings. This needs to be done with cooperation from the CTO as the Partnership treasurers have no sight of the CTO/police accounts. Each year the budget forecast contains known costs and income and is set to break even.

The Partnership Treasurer is responsible only for the relatively small sum (£0.40m to £0.9m) which is the difference between income and expenditure once all the CTO’s bills have been
paid. The surplus arises because of the uncertainty in numbers of takers for the speed awareness course (not all are eligible and not all those offered it will take it in Humberside).

Prior to 2015/16 partners contributed financially to the Partnership a sum of about £1.6m but with local authority cutbacks and loss of revenue Hull withdrew. This coincided with a change in the way income moved between police forces through the National Driver Offenders Scheme (NDORS) to take account of the new national database where an offender could take the course anywhere. This meant that income was due from other forces who provided courses for those caught speeding on Humberside’s roads, and vice versa. This meant that the Board could take the decision to make the courses in Humberside self-financing so all contributions from Local Authorities stopped and Hull re-joined.

This changed the financial risk. What would happen if there were economic or regulatory changes which meant the income dropped suddenly and left the CTO/police part of the Partnership with liabilities? For this reason an exit strategy has been devised whereby funds are set aside for closure costs such as release from premises leases. It is also prudent accounting to set aside at least one year’s operating costs so that the Partnership can show it will be a going concern and be able to pay its bills 12 months hence. The Partnership Manager and Treasurer have agreed that two years’ operating costs should be set aside.

On paper the reserves that have accrued over the years stand at £4.2m but given the new self-financing system £2.4m of these have been committed to capital projects agreed by the Board such as new average speed cameras to replace obsolete kit and capital replacement needs to 2019, the exit strategy, i-car replacement with i-van (i-car has come to the end of its life) and other expenditure approved by the Board. This means that the uncommitted reserves are £1.8m. Within this is the balance of the money that was contributed by the Local Authorities prior to self-financing. This needs to be held in a contingency fund and the new SLA needs to take account of how it might be dispersed if SRH Partnership ceases to exist.

The financial arrangements are complex but the Partnership has to be run as though it were a business – which it is not – it needs to be aware of the possible volatility of its income stream and each year produces a break even budget. The surplus accrues simply because of the unpredictable income stream made more unpredictable by the amount that comes back and goes from to the Partnership from NDORS in respect of drivers taking courses in places where they were not detected. The highest public service standards are employed in the management of the SRH finances through senior finance officers acting as treasurers. The surplus has been accounted for to cover extra risk to the police of the Partnership becoming self-funding.

Recommendations

The financial arrangements are complex and the highest public service standards are employed in their management through senior finance officers at ERYC acting as treasurers. It is recommended that ERYC to continue to act as treasurers and lead discussions with Policy Board on a regular basis how financial risks might change and be managed associated with the Partnership becoming self-funding.

The Partnership needs to be aware of the volatility of its income stream which is in part due to the unpredictability of the amount of funding that comes back to or goes from the Partnership via the National Driver Offenders Scheme (NDORS) in respect of drivers taking speed awareness courses in places where they were not detected. Scenario planning on a ‘what-if’ basis for different trends in income and expenditure
under different assumptions relating to the operation of the safety camera programme locally and nationally is a helpful aid to these discussions.

Reporting

The current line of reporting is from the members of the Board to (and from) their respective professional colleagues and elected members. The Chief Constable (or her representative) would be responsible for reporting to the Police and Crime Commissioner. Whilst the reporting within the Partnership is strong, these lines of reporting with outside are seen to be weak. The Board’s discussions on governance models should take full account of reporting lines to elected members. A quarterly briefing meeting is one mechanism.

Reporting from the Working Group to the Board takes place at the quarterly Board meetings with reports being presented on finance and road safety programme.

The Partnership reports to the public through its website where it gives information on campaigns, road safety initiatives and camera locations. It publishes an Annual Report which contains data on offences, collisions, casualties and speeds at SRH camera sites. This is over and above the Coalition Government minimum requirement for these data to be published for fixed sites.

Recommendation

SRH’s internal reporting mechanisms are very good but its engagement with the elected members of its partner organisations is poor and needs to be improved so that they are informed as to how the Partnership is funded and operates.
2. Operation and effectiveness of enforcement and diversionary activities and other road safety programmes

2.1. Establish how core, non-core and community sites are selected and how much enforcement is active at each. If possible, an estimate will be made from financial and operational records of the resource commitment to these activities in terms of vehicles and officers.

How this part of the review was undertaken.

The site selection protocols were reviewed and the signing and visibility guidelines. Financial records were viewed and resources commitments ascertained from minutes, progress reports, briefing papers and in discussion with the Partnership manager and finance accountants.

The safety camera programme

In 2014 SRH had 62 core sites. In 2015 this increased by 17 as the City of Hull re-joined the partnership. The predominant operation is with mobile cameras but there are seven fixed cameras and one average speed camera with a second in process of installation. Cameras cover about 3% of the region’s road network.

The core sites are selected by the Local Highway Authority (Local Authority or Highways England) in whose jurisdiction they lie according to a long standing protocol developed by the Department for Transport when the camera programme was nationally led. The sites are brought before the Partnership Board for agreement for the need to enforce the speeds at these locations. The enforcement operation is then run by the partnership on behalf of the Local Authority. Enforcement at a site is approved once the Local Highway Authority has established to the satisfaction of the Policy Board that the camera is the best solution and that it fits with its speed management policy.

Nearly all camera partnerships in England still use this protocol, including SRH. Some partnerships have made minor changes to allow for local conditions. Partnerships recognise the importance for transparency of operation of adhering to this protocol. It can be found on the SRH website http://www.saferroadshumber.com/about-safety-cameras/safety-camera-site-selection/

Enforcement schedules

Annually, after analysis of the previous year’s collisions, casualties and changes in speed each camera sites is assigned to a group where those with the highest number of casualties (weighted by speed) are prioritised for enforcement so that those with the greatest need receive the most visits. In recent years there have been about 10-12 sites in this category. Those with fewer casualties or a lower speeding problem are visited less often. Across sites of every type visits on average last about 2 hours the difference being the visit frequency. The enforcement schedule is drawn up by the Partnership’s data analyst in consultation with enforcement officers. Given the disperse nature of the sites a sensible and cost effective routing is needed to avoid unnecessary mileage to-ing and fro-ing between sites. This may mean that some amber and green sites are visited more often than others in their group.

Only fixed cameras can detect speeds over a 24 hour period 7 days a week. Speeding drivers speed at all times of day and night and the risk of a collision is often higher in the evenings and weekends. Mobile enforcement shifts are eight hours long and cover the hours
5am to 11pm and operate on a shift pattern that includes weekends. The early starts and late finishes relate to intelligence with respect to when speeds and collisions occur. Some enforcement is outside of these hours especially in holiday time on routes to the coast or for special events such as the Tour de Yorkshire. This can result in overtime. We are assured that these activities are intelligence led and not a way of paying for overtime.

The SRH website gives the daily enforcement schedule over about a three week period. It also reminds the public where the fixed cameras are located. [http://www.saferroadshumber.com/about-safety-cameras/daily-enforcement-schedule/](http://www.saferroadshumber.com/about-safety-cameras/daily-enforcement-schedule/)

**Non-core and sites of community concern**

For some people the use of cameras is still controversial despite international and national evidence strongly indicating that they are effective if correctly deployed and sited. But local communities request speed enforcement on a regular basis.

SRH operates a policy of enforcement at sites which do not meet the criteria for being part of the programme. These are **non-core sites** if they are identified by the Local Authority or **sites of community concern** if identified by local people. These sites may have a speeding problem - real or perceived but not a casualty problem as defined in the site selection protocol. The sites usually come forward for consideration through complaints by the public to the police or the local authority. These sites once agreed by the Partnership may be enforced by SRH officers or by the Humberside police and receive less frequent visits than the core sites. Because they are not part of the main programme they are not signed and do not appear on the daily enforcement list. It is understood that there are currently over 200 requests for enforcement at sites where the community has concerns about speeding traffic and 80 of these have had some active enforcement.

The issue of public concern about speeding traffic in their neighbourhood will be discussed again in Section 3.

**History of funding**

The Partnership’s income from its inception has been from people driving at speeds in excess of the posted limit either through hypothecation of fines or more recently through the national speed awareness courses. When the safety camera scheme was run by the Department for Transport the Partnership made a case for funding its enforcement programme. This was scrutinised by the DfT and agreed funds returned to the Partnership for its operation. When hypothecation ended there was no income to run camera enforcement activities so many local road safety partnerships ceased much of their activity. Then speed awareness courses began to be developed and have now been endorsed by Government (see Section 2.4 and Appendix A). Now all police forces enforce speeds using cameras in a combination of fixed, mobile and, increasingly average speed and run speed awareness courses for drivers who are eligible. See Section 2.4

From 2010 SRH began to run these courses but the Partners contributed to the costs of the enforcement in their jurisdictions. Over time a surplus in income over expenditure built up, partly as a result in changes to the thresholds at which a driver could be offered a course, and the Policy Board agreed that from the 2015-16 financial year the income from the revenue generated by the speed awareness courses could finance the programme in its entirety and that the Local Authorities would no longer contribute to the cost of enforcement at their camera sites.
The resource committed to the programme

The Central Ticket Office exists to process detections of all causes and not just those of speeding. Of the tickets issued for speeding offences about 60% of people are eligible for and are offered a speed awareness course. About another third are ineligible for a course (they may have been on one in the last three years) and their fines are collected by the Government Treasury and do not accrue to the partnership but the CTO needs staff to process these. Just under 10% go to court and their fines go to the Treasury but the CTO has the costs to administer. The final 2% or so are subject of no further action.

The staff complement has been reported elsewhere and amounts to 32.52 posts at the CTO of which seven are police and 25.5 management and administrative staff. Eight posts are for those who run the speed awareness schemes. There are two posts at East Riding Yorkshire Council. These are the full time Media and Marketing manager and the Treasurer whose SRH duties are invoiced from ERYC on a fee base. The reason these posts are not integers is that the CTO manager and deputy and the administrative staff are not fully charged to the Partnership because they do more than administer the speed camera enforcement (see above).

The Partnership operates four enforcement vans, two enforcement motorcycles, a box van and a 4x4 vehicle. Each van is equipped with a camera either a Redflex or a LTI light beam. There are eight cameras in total plus two suitable for use on the motorcycles. However, not all of these are in reliable working order so spares are often needed. All transport and equipment requires maintenance and this is charged to the Partnership.

There has been some debate about the use of police officers to undertake enforcement activities. It appears there is no requirement for the camera enforcement to be undertaken by the enforcement officers but the partnership and police have made a strong case for this to continue. The case rests on firstly on the ability of these officers to undertake other casualty reduction work such as enforcement of seat belt wearing and mobile phone use and secondly on the fact that their employment costs are met by the Partnership and do not come from the police budget. It is understood that two police officers would be required for looking at the film to detect whether an offence has been committed and as enquiry officer. If the remaining 5 posts were civilianised the costs of these transfers would fall on the police budget.

The expenditure of the Partnership has remained pretty constant over the last nine years. Employment costs have risen by about 10% over this period, property costs have almost doubled, and transport costs have gone up by about 50%. What has changed is the supplies and services which reflects the costs of providing the courses to more people from the 2012/13 financial year and national database payment to NDORS. (The cost of providing the courses in 2015/16 is separated out from the NDORS payments). Together this shows as a 57% increase in expenditure over a nine year period when the number of people processed has risen from 13,400 to 28,370.

The income to set against these costs has risen by 43% over the same period.

---

4 See for example Corporate Support Team SRH Briefing Note 10.10.2014 author A Ingram.
2.2. From available data and reports estimate the effectiveness of the whole programme in reducing casualties and to what extent the three types (core non-core and community concern) are effective/cost effective.

How this part of the review was undertaken.

Data given for each site in the Annual Review of sites was read and ones which had features of interest were discussed with the relevant local authority. The site grouping for enforcement (red amber green) was reviewed for 2014. Allsop’s internal review of effectiveness of the SRH programme was used and the Cochrane Collaboration systematic review of effectiveness used as examples of effectiveness.

Effectiveness studies

There is a strong positive link between speed and the likelihood of a collision. In general, the higher the speed the more severe is the resulting injury. A systematic review of camera operations across 35 national and international studies\(^5\) by the influential Cochrane Collaboration concluded that speed cameras are a worthwhile intervention for reducing the number of road traffic injuries and deaths.

Across all studies reviewed:

- 1% to 15% reduction in average speed
- 14% to 65%. reduction in proportion of vehicles speeding
- 8%-49% reduction in all crashes
- 11%-44% reduction in fatal or serious injury crashes
- 17%-58% reduction in killed or seriously injured casualties.

Across the whole of SRH’s core fixed and mobile camera programme\(^6\) there has been a positive influence on casualties with an estimated effectiveness of a 2.5% reduction in casualties of all severities but the impact has been greater on those killed or seriously injured with a 15% reduction relative to numbers in Humberside as a whole over the period from when the cameras became operational (the majority were commissioned in 2003) to the end of 2012\(^7\).

An additional analysis was undertaken of casualties after The City of Hull withdrew its 17 mobile cameras from Safer Roads Humber enforcement activities from 1 April 2011. The four fixed cameras and Highways Agency mobile cameras still operated. Through a lack of funding, other road safety activities were also curtailed. As part of the work for this report Prof. Heydecker (UCL) undertook a statistical analysis of the data for the suspended camera sites and for Hull City (1 April 2008 to 31 December 2014). This analysis indicates that over the period 1 January 2008 to end March 2011 there had been a consistent downward trend in road casualties across Hull of about 5% per annum. In the period from 1 April 2011 to end December 2014 this downward trend has ceased with no further long term improvement.


\(^6\) 52 active and 33 decommissioned cameras to 2012

\(^7\) The impact on fatal and serious casualties is statistically significant at 5% and indicative but not quite reaching the 5% for casualties of all severities (Allsop, R E. 2013 Analysis of collision data for speed cameras in Humberside v2).
Furthermore there has been an increase of about 20% in personal injury collisions\(^8\) and casualties across the City as a whole.

In terms of casualties at the camera sites, there are indications that there has been a small but not statistically significant increase at these sites which is over and above the general increase across the City as a whole.

**Non-core and community concern sites** Speeds at these sites are enforced on a more *ad hoc* basis and there are often no casualties but attention to these locations addresses concerns about anti-social speeding in neighbourhoods. For this reason it is difficult to assess effectiveness in the medium to longer term. In the days when the programme was nationally led Partnerships were encouraged to set aside 15% of their budget for such activity.

The Government issued guidance to safety camera partnerships about publishing their data on an annual basis and the format to be used. But it provided no guidance as to how to interpret the data in these Annual Reports by the general public, the press or by road safety professionals. The RAC Foundation has filled this gap by producing its own guidance. A link to this\(^9\) should be put on the website and the advice followed by the Partnership – bringing in the expertise to do this analysis on a contract basis if necessary. The performance of the safety cameras operated by the Partnership should be presented (not every year, say every three to five years to fit in with strategy development) to the public through the website, to the Board, the Working Group and the individual local authorities to help them make decisions as to the shape of the programme going forward.

The PCC commissions a quarterly survey of public opinion and one such survey included questions about speed and cameras with seven out of ten respondents agreeing that mobile cameras help to improve safety on the road whilst about two out of 10 disagreed. The other 10% either were neutral or didn’t know.

**Recommendation**

*A full review\(^{10}\) should be commissioned (every year is too frequent but every three to five years is about right) of the performance of the safety cameras operated by the Partnership and presented to the Board, the Working Group and the individual local authorities to help them make decisions as to the shape of the programme going forward. The public should be informed through the website*

**Monetary values assigned to casualty prevention.**

The Department for Transport issues a value to society for prevention of death and injury. For 2012 prevention of a death is valued at £1,703,822, a serious injury £191,462 and a slight injury £14,760.

Starkly put, the prevention of two deaths across the partnership area whether by enforcement of speed limits or other road safety work, more than compensates for the cost of running the entire programme for one year. However, there are so few fatalities at camera sites that it is unrealistic to use this figure. The analysis indicated that serious injuries are most affected by speed enforcement and the figure for preventing them currently stands at £191,462. In 2015 the cost of running the partnership equated to saving 17 serious

---

\(^8\) (95% confidence interval of 14% to 36%)
\(^{10}\) See for example the method given by the RAC Foundation in [http://www.racfoundation.org/research/safety/speed-camera-data-report](http://www.racfoundation.org/research/safety/speed-camera-data-report)
casualties across the partnership area. Current figures for KSI casualty reductions show that since 2011 there has been a reduction of around 80 KSI’s across the Humberside area.

2.3 Using data collected by the partnership to establish whether site selection protocols have been correctly applied and whether these need to be reviewed in the light of operational experience.

How this part of the review was undertaken.

The data for the baseline period given in the Annual review was considered along with discussion with Local Authority engineers responsible for site selection. However, some of the current post holders were not in post when the sites were selected.

Site selection

The approach to selection of sites is correct according to the procedures laid down by the Department in its Circular 01/2007. There is a decision tree to determine the use of cameras as an enforcement tool. Besides there being a suitable location for the camera or van, other options to reduce casualty numbers should have been considered so that camera deployment is a ‘last resort’ [see current Site selection and signage in Humberside].

Mobile sites may be 0.4 to 5km in length. Within these stretches of road there needs to be a safe and legal place for the enforcement van to park. For the shorter sites (400m) this can sometime pose a challenge as the central point may not be suitable. A risk assessment is undertaken at each site to feed into this process and this determines to a certain extent where the parking platforms are located. The risk assessment is currently being updated.

Many of the sites were selected in 2003/04 and some have been decommissioned since then and some new ones added. The data for these are all given in the SRH’s Annual Report. It is generally recognised by SRH and others that in the future the site selection protocol will need updating to take account of improvements in road safety, changing traffic patterns, demographics and changes in where collisions happen.

Discussions are already underway between partnership managers at regional and national levels to assess and agree a national code of best practice for site selection which can accommodate local variations.

It must be stressed that covertly operated cameras (i.e. those that operate from unmarked vehicles) have no place in the work of any Safety Camera Partnerships, SRH included. However, if the Chief Constable wishes enforcement of speed to take place from other vehicles by officers outside the Partnership programme, this is an operational decision for her and her officers. The selection criteria options being discussed will be taken before the SRH Board in due course.

Site decommissioning

As part of the annual analysis of sites some sites may be identified which ‘have done their job’ or they may be redundant because an engineering or other traffic management solution is in place. The partnership has a decommissioning policy. If there have been no casualties for at least three years and average speeds are below the National Police Chiefs Council recommendation (NPCC formerly ACPO) they may be brought before the Partnership Working Group and Board for a decision on decommissioning them. The Local Authority has the last say in this matter because there is sometimes local opposition to ‘losing their camera’. There is sometimes a concern, professional, political or public that casualties will
increase again once a camera has been removed, and sometimes this happens. In its Annual Report SRH reports the casualties and speeds at its decommissioned sites.

**Recommendation**

The Working Group should continue to take an active part in discussions around revision of site selection criteria.

A Partnership wide speed management strategy should be developed which dovetails with those being developed by the individual partners. It should include the required actions to change behaviour such as awareness campaigns, training, road engineering and an enforcement plan.

**2.4. Establish the mechanism and implementation of driver awareness courses.** This review will not assess effectiveness of these courses unless an estimate of short, medium or longer term effectiveness can be made from existing local data and reports.

**How this part of the review was undertaken.**

Discussions with National Driver Offenders Scheme (NDORS) and managers of other partnerships. Review of NDORS and Government strategy documents regarding enforcement of low level offending. Discussions with SRH acting Partnership manager and recently retired manager. Review of SRH documents.

**Mechanism**

In January 2011 Mike Penning (then Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Department for Transport) wrote to Mick Giannasi in his role as ACPO lead for Roads Policing stating that as Road Safety was an important priority for the Coalition Government he believed that those drivers detected travelling not far above the speed limit and did not have a recent record of speeding should be dealt with through raising awareness and education rather than prosecuting and fining them. He then goes onto say he supports greater use of the nationally availably education courses and that those committing an offense would rightly pay toward the cost of their enforcement and the education activity offered in place of prosecution. He reiterated his view that this should not become a way of making additional revenue or used for other enforcement activity. He wanted the approach to be transparent and open to scrutiny so he encouraged police and local authorities to publish data on fixed cameras (impact on speeds, casualties and the number and treatment of offenders). However, Humberside publishes data on its mobile camera as well as its fixed through its Annual Report.

The 2011 Coalition Government Strategic Framework for Road Safety endorses this approach with the statement:

> Remedial education for those who make mistakes and for low level offences where this is more effective than financial penalties and penalty points

---

11 Letter attached in Appendix A  
The Government’s 2015 Road Safety Statement reiterates:

The vast majority of first time offenders will not incur a fixed penalty notice or penalty points but will instead be offered an educational course whether to invite a motorist to a course is at the discretion of the police\textsuperscript{13}.

These courses are run to a national standard and are called national speed awareness courses (NSAC). They are based on academic research and are independently evaluated. In December 2012 this scheme won the Prince Michael International Road Safety premier award, recognising the value of enforcement being met by a course of education rather than prosecution/penalty\textsuperscript{14}.

Implementation

The amount over the speed limit at which a driver is offered this diversion to a course instead of a fixed penalty ticket and points on their licence is determined by the Chief Constable following the current guidance range of the speed limit+10\%+2-9 miles/hr (previous to 2011 this was speed limit+10\%+2-6 miles/h).

Since this widening of the speed band there has been an increase in the number of people being offered and taking the courses. This is reflected in the increased income and associated expenditure. However, the year on year increase in offences detected in Humberside is less than the increase detected nationally and reported on the NDORS website\textsuperscript{15}. In 2013 there was a fall in numbers detected and the final figures for 2015 show little change from 2014\textsuperscript{16}.

The Humberside Police deliver the course themselves on behalf of the Safer Roads Humber Partnership. Some other forces contract an outside provider such as AA DriveTech or TTC to deliver it on their behalf. This has an impact on the funding but not on the course content.

The drivers pay a fee approaching, but not more than, the fine (currently £100) that would have been imposed if a fixed penalty ticket had been issued. The charge may be set to recover the cost of the enforcement activity (vehicles, cameras, detection officers), providing the administration to process the offences (people and premises), and running the courses (administration, finance, premises, trainers). In addition there is a levy to the central NDORS funds for maintaining the national data base (an offender may take a course anywhere and not necessarily in the force area in which they were detected). There is a movement of funds through NDORS a) to compensate forces who provide courses for ‘outsiders’ and b) back to detecting forces whose costs would not be met by those choosing to be educated elsewhere.

SRH charges a £95 fee (which is within the range £75-£100 charged by other Partnerships) of which £40 goes to NDORS. NDORS keeps £5 for their administration, research and development costs, £35 of it goes to forces providing courses for ‘outsiders’ and £35 comes back for every offender detected in the SRH area but choosing to take a course elsewhere. The two £35s may not balance out.

\textsuperscript{14} https://ndors.org.uk/courses/
\textsuperscript{15} 2010 to 2011 the increase nationally was 42\% - in Humberside it was 37\%
\textsuperscript{16} 2013-2014 there was an increase nationally of 20\% - in Humberside a fall of 4\% 2015 saw another fall of about 4\%
The advantage to SRH in providing the courses themselves is that the overhead and profit element which would be payable to an outside contractor is kept in house and can be used for other road safety education activities. These are described in section 2.5.

**Effectiveness**

It is difficult for the effectiveness of the scheme to be evaluated at the local level but this has been possible nationally as described below.

In 2011 ACPO (now NPCC) published a report it had commissioned from Brainbox Research on an Evaluation of the National Speed Awareness Course. The evaluation ran through the last quarter of 2010 and involved over 2000 people taking a questionnaire before and after the course and a follow up three months later. Additionally six focus groups were conducted.

The results provide evidence that the National Speed Awareness Course (NSAC) produces changes in key psychological predictors of speeding, namely instrumental and affective attitudes, moral norms, self-efficacy and intentions.

A total of 99% of clients who responded at follow-up reported that they had changed their driving after attending the course, notably driving more slowly, being more aware of the road environment and of their speed, and feeling less stressed while driving. Participants believed they would gain less enjoyment from speeding and after the course, positive attitudes towards speeding decreased and negative attitudes increased.

The DfT and Road Safety Trust have recently let a contract to conduct an up to date evaluation of the (NSAC) scheme including the impact of the courses on intentions and attitudes to speed, on understanding and knowledge of speed limits, and on reoffending/reconviction rates. This should be available in 2017. The estimates of reconviction rates will be of particular interest because we do not have reliable data on these at present.

**2.5. Establish other road safety initiatives, their operation, effectiveness, partner engagement, financing and approval.**

**How this part of the review was undertaken.**

This part of the review was conducted by looking at the campaigns developed by the partnership and assessing whether or not they are in line with good practice in terms of intervention development and evaluation.

**Road safety education, campaigns and enforcement**

The Government in its 2015 Road Safety Statement is keen to:

> Take tough action against those who speed, exceed the drink-drive limit, take drugs or use their mobile phone while on the road;

[17](https://ndors.org.uk/files/6614/4983/2018/Final_Speed_Awareness_Evaluation_Report_v1.4.pdf)
Continue our THINK! campaign to provide road user education and influence behaviour in a targeted and engaging way

Both the Board and the Working Group share the SRH Mission statement:

Reducing the number of casualties and collisions across the Humber region and to bring a change in behaviour and attitude to the use of our region’s roads.

The terms of reference of the Working Group includes

Developing road safety strategies and campaigns to reduce the number of casualties in the partnership’s high priority groups which include young drivers and their passengers, motorcyclists and cyclists.

Driver behaviour is not only changed by enforcement and education about speed choice but by improving skills and knowledge of all road users. The challenge to the SRH’s road safety professionals is to identify the groups of road users most at risk of injury and work together to develop and deliver campaigns which use resources effectively and reduce duplication between the Partnership and the partner organisations. Many of the campaigns have been developed through the multi-agency interaction of the Partnership and it is likely they would not have happened without this. The Partnership supports each local authority with advice, information and support. It is good practice to involve multiple agencies in the delivery of community safety interventions.

The SRH provides an overarching mechanism for delivery of mixed media campaigns (radio, social media etc) campaigns across Humberside. The Partnership’s communication campaigns are award winning. For example, the campaign addressing the overrepresentation of motorcycle casualties “some ones son” won the Prince Michael International Road Safety Award in 2012. This is a prestigious award judged by road safety experts. The Partnership delivers nationally developed education interventions such as Bikesafe and the Speed Awareness courses. The partnership uses appropriate methods to engage with young people such as the highly interactive, i-Car soon to be replaced with the i-Van.

Other road users are supported through pedestrian, cycle and motorcycle safety initiatives in line with the SRH road safety objectives. It actively promotes road safety messages with combined media and enforcement campaigns in alignment with the national and European enforcement campaign calendar. The Partnership funds targeted enforcement to ‘boost’ police enforcement in line with campaign objectives. This combined education and enforcement approach is in line with evidence based good practice.

SRH campaigns are data led, using state of the art marketing techniques with an understanding that behaviour change is best achieved with a combination of education and enforcement. The campaigns are designed in line with good practice using the RoSPA E-valu-it tool kit framework – a tool that was developed with funding from the Department for Transport.

Historically the SRH Working Group has been allocated by the Board a budget of £200,000 of which half is for enforcement campaigns run by the police and half for road safety education and communications campaigns. As described in Section 1.2 this is changing to a model where the Working Group proposes an annual programme of work covering all activities in a costed bid for funding to the Policy Board.

The Working Group has recently reported to the Policy Board for approval its costed plan for activities through 2016-17. Its takes account of local, national (THINK!), and European
(TISPOL\textsuperscript{18} - European Traffic Police Network) campaigns. The planned monthly schedule targets the so called ‘fatal four’ (speed, seat belts, alcohol and mobile phones).

\textsuperscript{18} https://www.tispol.org/
3. Communication with the public and public perception of SRH

How this part of the review was conducted

The website was reviewed and compared with those of several other partnerships. Review of the community survey data commissioned by the office of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

A Communication strategy is needed

The Partnership lacks a communication strategy and this is contributing to the view that there is a lack of transparency. Most of what the Partnership is doing in terms of campaigns and camera enforcement is to be found somewhere on its website but it takes a determined person to find it.

A new website and social media

The website is outdated and needs a revamp as a priority action as it is too text based and difficult to navigate around. The latest news is out of date (Christmas drink drive) and this does not give a good impression. This is recognised by the Partnership but it is understood that the website is hosted by East Riding Yorkshire Council.

It is not a trivial task to update the website and it will take some time to achieve but a digital manager dedicated to this activity will transform this important tool for the outward facing communication with the public and other road safety professionals.

Social media is underused by the Partnership and this is has become very important for communication. Twitter and Facebook, should be incorporated into the website to give members of the public a channel to engage directly with the Partnership (see for example Suffolk http://www.suffolkroadsafe.net/suffolk-info/speeding-in-suffolk/ Essex, https://safersessexroads.org/).

Better information about camera locations

The public would like more information on the location of cameras. This is on the website but not as well presented as it could be. There is a pictogram to click on and it goes through to a link to a list of the daily enforcement schedule.

Other Partnerships have a pictogram of all of camera locations and when one is selected it goes to a page for this camera giving the data about its operation (see for example Cheshire https://www.warrington.gov.uk/roadsafety/info/2/camera_locations/7/camera_locator_interactive_map?lt=53.389535&lg=-2.599854 and Devon and Cornwall http://www.prsp.org.uk/cameraWatch/index.aspx).

This information is in the SRH Annual Report but better presented information could be given.

Public views of enforcement activities

A quarterly survey of public views about policing activities is commissioned by office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Humberside. In the last Community Survey Findings (Quarter Three), 2015, the road safety section of the survey identified that there may be a number of areas in which SRH could communicate better with the public. Generally the vast majority of respondents support the road safety value of fixed (66%) and mobile (71%) cameras, and this increases the public’s support for the police. However, a fifth questioned whether the cameras were in the correct locations and 42% agreed that it would be useful to know in advance the location of mobile cameras. SRH might need to communicate better.
with the public to explain why cameras are located where they are and the casualty reductions they are associated with. Respondents were highly confident in the effectiveness of other road safety measures were effective, particularly vehicle activated signs (88%), road policing patrols (87%) and road safety education in schools / colleges (86%).

Recommendations

The Partnership should develop a public communication strategy which is regularly updated by the Working Group and reported to the Policy Board.

The website is poor and out of date. It should become independent from ERYC and a part time digital manager be appointed on a contract basis paid for by SRH funds (this is common in this area of work) to redesign and keep up to date the content. The website should incorporate social media to enable two way communication with members of the public.

The presentation of information and data needs a more modern approach following guidelines for presenting data to lay audiences. Other Partnerships’ websites provide good models for layout and content.

The effectiveness of cameras could be communicated more clearly achieved using simple infographic style presentations.

---

Speed Enforcement and Education

Road safety is an important priority for the Coalition Government, as I know it is for the police, business and the general motoring public. I want to maintain the record of having the safest roads in the world and build upon it. So my aim is to develop a package of policies that work for the vast majority of motorists who drive responsibly, while targeting the actions of the deliberate and dangerous few.

Where motorists have been detected travelling not far above the speed limit and do not have a recent record of speeding, the most appropriate and effective way of dealing with them may well be through raising awareness and education rather than simply prosecuting and fining them. I therefore support greater use being made of nationally available educational courses for tackling this type of offending where a road safety benefit can be demonstrated. This can help reform driver behaviour and deliver safer roads, in a fair and proportionate way. In contrast, effective enforcement and tough penalties are needed for the most dangerous offences and repeat offenders, through fines, penalty points and the courts.

It is right that people committing offences should pay towards the cost of their enforcement and the education activity offered in place of prosecution. However this should not become a way of making additional revenue or used for other enforcement activity.

Educational courses are offered on the basis that they are a more, or at least as an, effective intervention than prosecution. Therefore it is important that they continue to be evidence-based, evaluated, meet national standards and can be demonstrated to deliver safety improvements. I also consider that
courses need to be consistent across England and available nationally. So a motorist can take a course in their local area or anywhere else that they prefer, no matter where the infringement was committed.

The evidence shows that in the right places, speed cameras do reduce speeds and casualties. However cameras are just one of a number of approaches to managing speed, such as road design, vehicle activated signs, education and road traffic police patrols. Speeding is just one area of careless or reckless behaviour, and it is equally important to tackle other issues such as careless and dangerous driving. So I support fully the intention of the police to extend educational courses to cover a range of offences, to supplement enforcement of the most dangerous behaviours.

Localism is central to a balanced, efficient and effective approach to road safety and enforcement. We need local road safety officers and the police, selecting the right tools for the issue. That said, we do consider that spending on road safety, including effective enforcement activity, should continue to be a high priority. It is crucial that the new approach is transparent and open to public scrutiny so I encourage police and local authorities to publish data on cameras (the impact on speeds, casualties and the number and treatment of offenders) as well as other areas of enforcement. Equally it is important that the costs and the treatment of revenues need to be clear to the public.

I understand that you are keen for your colleagues and my officials to work together on a number of issues during the next few months, including related to how reasonable levels of enforcement should be sustained, publication of information and securing back office efficiency savings. I endorse the need for this work and look forward to progress on it.

MIKE PENNING