

---

**Decision Session**  
**Executive Member for City Strategy**

**4 January 2011**

Report of the Director of City Strategy

## **SIX MONTHLY REVIEW OF SPEEDING ISSUES**

### **Summary**

1. This report gives an update on the collaborative Speed Review Process, set up in conjunction with the Police and Fire Service. This ensures that speed concerns are considered, and acted on, through partnership collaboration, giving a stronger and more robust response to the issues raised.
2. The report advises the Executive Member of further locations where concerns about traffic speeds have been raised, and provides an update on progress towards assessing these against the agreed prioritisation framework.
3. This report recommends the Executive Member supports the continuation of a partnership approach to dealing with speeding complaints; following the success of an approach developed and piloted in York.

### **Recommendations**

4. The Executive Member for City Strategy is recommended to:
  - I. Support the continuation of a partnership approach to dealing with speed complaints, which results in, a wider, more in depth process to tackle speed issues in York (Speed Review Process, Option 1).
  - II. Note, that from January 2011 North Yorkshire Police (NYP) will no longer regard the Speed Review Process as a “pilot” in the York and Selby areas.
  - III. Note that North Yorkshire Police have given notice to CYC that there will be a managed withdraw from the administration and management role they currently perform within the Speed Review Process, resulting in an increased work load within CYC, if the same level of service is to be provided.
  - IV. Note that NYP intend to only undertake action at community speed concern sites, once they have been analysed via the Partnership Speed Review Process.

- V. Note that new sites recommended for feasibility reviews by Engineering Services on the 6<sup>th</sup> July 10 and in this current report will not be assessed in detail until further Capital funding is available. As and when Capital funding is available, locations will be prioritised by one or all of the following criteria:
- Accident data
  - Mean and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds
  - Proximity to schools and shops.
- VI. Note the petition from New Lane, Huntington, and that it has been investigated under the review process, with a recommendation to improve the “gateway” to the 30 limit. The work is due to be carried out from this years (2010/11) Capital budget.
- VII. Note the petition from Moorlands Road, Skelton, and that it has been investigated under the review process, and that it will go forward to the Engineering team for assessment of cost effective speed reduction measures, as and when Capital funding becomes available.

Reason: To advise the Executive Member of the current status of the speed review process and provide an update on individual petitions and speed complaints.

## **Background**

5. The Council receives many complaints about speeding vehicles from a number of sources including residents, elected members and representatives of local groups, such as resident associations. To help manage this, a data led method of assessing all speeding issues in York was approved at the Meeting of the Executive Member for City Strategy and Advisory Panel on 30 October 2006. This established that speeding issues should be assessed against certain criteria. The criteria for assessment are shown within **Annex A**.
6. In the past it was evident that many of these complaints were also reported to other agencies including the Police and the Fire Service, which resulted in an overlap of work that was not a cost effective or consistent way of dealing with these community concerns. By working together in partnership we have been able to pool resources, knowledge and expertise to fully investigate all concerns raised.
7. A simplified diagram of how the process works is shown at **Annex B**.
8. The form for reporting issues is available on the council web site and is reproduced at **Annex C**. An electronic system for reporting issues is planned.

## **Progress on Speed Review Process and Partnership**

9. Casualty reduction is a key target for the council. We await new Government policy on Road Safety, due in April 2011, but it is anticipated that casualty reduction will stay as a key commitment from the new

government. Casualty reduction was also a principal objective of the Council's second Local Transport Plan (LTP) and its Road Safety Strategy. It is anticipated that casualty reduction, will also form part of the third Local Transport Plan.

10. The last 3 years (to end of 2009) Killed and Seriously Injured statistics for York are shown in the table below.

<b>KSI</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>
Pedestrians	19	20	10
Pedal Cyclists	8	17	11
Motor Cyclists	28	22	11
Car Occupants	33	36	25
Other	5	0	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>60</b>

11. Assessment of speed complaints, through a data led process, highlights that most of the locations identified by residents do not have a speed related casualty problem. This suggests that a lot of community concerns around speed are of perceived danger or "accidents waiting to happen".
12. There are no locations, of the thirteen so far investigated within this report period (July – Dec 2010) where high speeding traffic is causing a casualty issue. (i.e. Sites that score a one or two on the criteria, as per **Annex A**).
13. It is acknowledged, however, that encouraging drivers to moderate their speed to suit the prevailing conditions is important, since driver error is the major contributory factor in many accidents. Lower speeds reduce the chances of a collision occurring, and the severity of resulting casualties.

## **Collaboration**

14. As part of the Speed Review Process all locations were visited and risk assessed by CYC & Police Officers prior to speed surveys being undertaken, to assess the environment. It is unlikely that it will be possible to continue this approach when the Police resources are removed, after January 2011. However it is planned that from January 2011 the CYC officer will make site visits with NYF&R who will fit the speed recorder data boxes, at the same visit. This ensures that a site visit and risk assessment of most of the sites is carried out and also assists our Partners, North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue (NYF&R) in increasing the number of radar boxes it is possible to fit in a given time.
15. NYF&R undertake speed surveys in areas identified as not having an injury issue, but where there are community or individual concerns about speed. As it is estimated that speed surveys cost c.£200 each to undertake the input of these resources by Partners helps to investigate community concerns in greater detail.
16. CYC will continue to fund speed surveys in areas highlighted (by Police Records) as "high" accident locations as part of the ongoing commitment to

reduce killed and seriously injured (KSI's).

17. Once speed surveys are returned, these are analysed by the Partnership team, to determine, where they fall within the criteria, and what, if any further action could be taken. (A summary of the various initiatives or “tools currently available to tackle speed” can be found at the end of **Annex A**)

### **Prioritisation of Speeding Issues Raised**

18. In the last 6 months between July 10 – Dec 10 there have been a total of 52 locations put forward for investigation, with a further 2 locations where petitions have been put forward.
19. All are documented in **Annex D**, along with any results from investigations. This shows that 13 of the 52 locations have been investigated, There are 39 locations that are still awaiting investigation; the slow progress is because of time and resource constraints on all Services and Partnership agencies involved. We shall continue to work on the investigations, as yet to be undertaken and will present findings via the regular 6 monthly review report. After analysis against the criteria the following actions have been advised.

### **Category 1 (high speeds and high accidents)**

20. None of the current complaints investigated fall within the category 1 criteria

### **Category 2 (low speeds and high accidents)**

21. None of the current complaints investigated fall within the category 2 criteria.

### **Category 3 (high speeds and low accidents)**

22. All the below sites have been scored category 3 under the criteria at **Annex A**. Those referred to Engineering for consideration of cost effective measures available to reduce speeds, will be looked at, as and when Capital funding becomes available.
  - a. Sim Balk Lane (10 91 0 070) – refer to Engineering
  - b. Eason View (10 91 0 080) – refer to Engineering
  - c. Usher Lane (10 91 0 190) – refer to Engineering
  - d. Murton Lane, Murton (10 91 0 260) – refer to Engineering
  - e. B1224 Wetherby Road (10 91 0 320) – refer to Engineering
  - f. Murton Way (10 91 0 230) – refer to Engineering and targeted enforcement

## Category 4 (low speeds and low accident)

23. All the below sites have been scored category 4 under the criteria at **Annex A**, which also includes information on the SID (speed indicator device) Scheme. Please see Annex A for details.
- a. Moor Lane Murton (10 91 0 240) – offer SID
  - b. A1079 Hull Road, Nr Thornbeck, Dunnington (10 91 0 270) – No further action, SID not suitable for 40 mph limit roads.
  - c. Moorcroft Road, Woodthorpe (10 91 0 340) – offer SID
  - d. Oaken Grove (10 91 0 310, reported on at EMAP 2008) – can now also offer SID
  - e. North Lane, Huntington (10 91 0 170)- No further action. SID not suitable for 60 mph limit roads.
  - f. York Road, Haxby (South 10 91 0 210) – offer SID
  - g. Old Orchard, Haxby (10 91 0 290) – offer SID

## Petitions received

### Petition 1, Moorlands Road Skelton

*“The Residents of Moorlands Road, Skelton, York call upon the City of York Council to address the issue of speeding traffic along Moorlands Road, in accordance with the Speed Management Plan.”*

24. This location was investigated under the Review Process, and was reported on at the 6 July 2010 City Strategy Decision Session. The results of the investigation were as follows: -
- a. Accident Data – there have been no accidents at this location over the last 3 years. It is acknowledged that there was a fatal accident, on Moorlands Road in February 2010, but this was on a rural section, some distance from the residential area of concern.
  - b. Speed data – eight day x twenty four hour speed surveys were taken, at locations near to houses 7 & 8 ending on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2010, these recorded the following results: -

	Mean (average speed)	85 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
Towards Skelton	33 mph	40mph
From Skelton	35 mph	43 mph

- c. The results of this investigation are that the speeds recorded at this location are too high for the 30 limit, however there are no accidents, thus under the Criteria shown at **Annex A** the location was scored as a “3” (high speeds, but low accidents). It has been referred to the engineering team for investigation into any cost effective measures available to reduce these speeds.
- d. The current situation is that there is insufficient Capital funding available for this scheme to be considered within the current 2010/11 period, but the location will be kept on a list for inclusion in the 11/12 programme if affordable. As and when Capital funding is available for Engineering work, locations will be prioritised by one or all of the following criteria: -
- Accident data
  - Mean and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds
  - Proximity to schools and shops.
- e. NYP have made the following comments in relation to Moorlands Road. NYP are tasked to reduce casualties on the roads of North Yorkshire. The North Yorkshire Police therefore prioritise their finite resources to that endeavour. There is no injury accident history in the village or in the proximity of the currently posted 30mph speed limit. The current 30mph speed limit on Moorlands Road does not fit with DfT guidelines and the speed data indicates that it is poorly observed. The North Yorkshire Police officially objected to the making of the original order when it was first proposed as this situation was foreseen. The effective management of the road is the responsibility of the City of York Council and remedial action should be taken as appropriate by that organisation.

### **Petition 2, New Lane Huntington**

*“Liberal Democrats, Petition New Lane Speeding. As residents of Huntington we are concerned at the speed of traffic on New Lane, Huntington & request that City of York Council investigate what measures can be taken to address the problem.”*

25. This location was investigated under the Review Process, and was reported on initially at the EMAP in July 2008 and subsequently at the Decision Session in December 2009 and at the Decision Session in July 2010. The results of the investigation, initially reported at EMAP in July 08 were as follows: -
- a. Accident Data – 3 slight and 1 serious injury accidents, none of which

were speed related.

- b. Speed Data – seven day x twenty four hour data was recorded at 2 locations in the 30 limit, ending on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2008 the following results were recorded: -

South of Jockey Lane,

	Mean (average) speed	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile speed
To Jockey Lane	33mph	38mph
From Jockey Lane	32mph	36mph

North of Jockey Lane,

	Mean (average) speed	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile speed
To Jockey Lane	31mph	37mph
From Jockey Lane	30mph	35mph

- c. Thus, New Lane, Huntington scored a “3” under the criteria, as shown in **Annex A** and was forwarded to the Engineering team for investigation into any cost effective measures available to reduce these speeds.
- d. On 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2009, New Lane was chosen as a site to do a joint Partnership Speed Education day (Now superseded by NYP Speed Awareness Courses). Thirty speeding drivers were stopped in total. CYC road safety staff were actually involved in the day and it can be reported that 100% of those speeders stopped, were all residents from the surrounding local area.
- e. By December 2009, Partners had agreed to consider all speed complaints via a Partnership approach. Thus when new complaints were received from New Lane, Huntington, the results of the earlier investigation were again re-considered and reported on a Decision Session in December 2009. This resulted in New Lane, also being included in NYP target plan for speed enforcement.
- f. By July 2010, Engineering had concluded their investigation into any cost effective speed reduction measures, and these proposals formed part of Annex E on that report. (to improve gateways at 30 limit). This work is being funded from the 2010/11 capital fund, and should be concluded by the end of March 2011.

## **Update on other related issues.**

### **Electronic form for reporting**

26. The introduction of an electronic system was not supported by the police whilst the management of the process was under Police control. With administration of the scheme being transferred to CYC, development of electronic reporting will be progressed, when appropriate staff expertise and resources are available.

### **Engineering sites identified at July 10 Decision Session**

27. Funds have been allocated from the Capital budget 2010/11 to conclude the engineering work recommended in Annex E of the July 10 report. Currently there is no identified budget to progress any **new** sites that are to be put forward for Engineering consideration, from either the July 10 report or this current Jan 11 report. All locations will be kept on a list and will be considered for inclusion in the 2011/12 capital programme.

### **SID training at locations identified at July 10 Decision Session**

28. Of the thirty locations offered the SID scheme at the July 10 Decision Session, which would help communities to educate drivers who speed in their neighbourhoods no one has requested to join the scheme.

### **Police Enforcement**

29. From the July 2010 report ten locations were given to the Community Policing teams for targeted enforcement. It would be inappropriate to report on the numbers of tickets for speeding given out at these locations, as the whole point of the Police presence is speed compliance rather than speed enforcement. In most of the ten given locations, it is highly likely that the presence of officers will result is traffic obeying the limit and few, if any tickets being issues.
30. However it can reported that, as a whole in 2009, North Yorkshire Police issued 10,900 tickets for speeding. This does not include those reported for summons, but does include around 1,100 from the A1 where cameras are in use by the Highways Agency because of road works.
31. Under the present "Policing Pledge" feedback is given to communities, but purely in relation to the number of checks undertaken and tickets issued. The police can use Ward Committee Newsletters to indicate the location and results of speed checks.
32. Whilst the Police acknowledge that it would be extremely valuable to evaluate the impact of the measures taken, in the current circumstances and with current staffing levels, this would be difficult to achieve.
33. North Yorkshire Police have also stated that from January 2011 they will no longer regard the Speed Review Process as a "pilot" in the York and Selby areas. It is intended that the process will be rolled out across the whole of



the North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) area with a 'go live' date of the 1st April 2011. The scheme, across North Yorkshire, will be administered and managed by NYCC Highways Staff and NYP have given notice to CYC that they will withdraw from the administration and management role they currently perform in York. Whilst NYP have made it clear that this service will not just suddenly be removed (and any required support will be available to CYC in the short term), this will mean a significant increased work load within CYC to pick up these roles.

34. NYP have also stated that following the Speed Review Process roll out, they will not undertake any action at a location identified by a community concern report unless it has FIRST been analysed via the process, with an agreed partnership decision made on that data.
35. NYP has intimated that from the 1st April 2011, they will direct all complaints received from members of the community regarding the speed of vehicles along any road to the appropriate highway authority.
36. NYP have stated that any enforcement requirement will be undertaken solely at their discretion and with due regard to their operational requirements

### **Safety Camera Update**

37. In March 2010, after a 95 Alive Partnership feasibility study into the viability of Safety Camera's in North Yorkshire, NYP and CYC both agreed "in principle" to the use of Safety Camera's. However, NYCC, the third member of the partnership, deferred their decision until the spring of 2011 because of the uncertain political and funding issues. No further progress has been made, and the 95 Alive Partnership await new Government proposals on Road Safety (due April 2011) and a clearer idea of what, if any funding will be available for a Safety Camera Partnership to be progressed across North Yorkshire.

## **Options and Analysis**

### **Speed Review Process Options Proposals.**

#### **Option 1**

38. To continue with the Speed Review Process, in Partnership with the Police and Fire Service. However Members do need to be aware that in the last 12 months over the last two reports, all complaints have scored criteria as three, (low accidents, high speeds) or four, (low accidents, low speed).
39. This means that the work being done on the speed review process cannot be considered as "casualty reduction work" as in the majority of complaint locations, there are no "speed related casualties". Full criteria shown in **Annex A.**
40. The budget and action by the Council is limited where we cannot show a

reduction in casualties. Priority for funds must go to road safety initiatives and locations that target casualty reduction. We await further updates on changes to policy on Road Safety from the new Government due in April 2011.

41. Where speed has been evidenced as above the criteria (**Annex A**) it is recognised, by the Partnership, that evaluation could assess intervention effects. This evaluation could only be undertaken, given the necessary resources.

## **Option 2**

42. To revert back to our own, independent, but smaller process, which would exclude the help from Partners with speed surveys, and analysis of data and targeted enforcement. This would leave agencies and systems running concurrently. It would also mean that the 111 sites looked at over the last year, which scored three and four on the criteria would not have been investigated. As NYP are also stating that they will not undertake any enforcement at any community concern site, without it first going through the Speed Review Process, it could leave community concern sites, that could benefit from Police enforcement without any investigation.

## **Analysis**

43. Option 1, enables us to fully investigate and collect data on every speed issue brought to our attention, this is because a partnership approach brings extra resources and expertise to provide a more in depth, data led investigation. The extent and timing of the investigation and surveys will be affected by the resources available to each partner organisation.
44. Option 2, would ensure that speed issues that had a high casualty record would be fully investigated, but speed issues that did **not** have a high casualty record would not be as fully investigated. Without partner help we would not be able to do as many speed surveys or have evidence led, partnership agreement on the best use of tools and resource for dealing with individual community concerns.

## **Corporate Priorities**

45. The Council's Corporate Strategy aim is to increase the use of public and other environmentally friendly modes of transport is relevant to this report. Fears of being a casualty are a real deterrent to more people walking and in particular cycling. By implementing a robust programme of speed management measures to reduce excessive speeding, which targets the minority of drivers whose driving behaviour poses the greatest risk to others, overall safety can be improved and an increase in active transport use achieved. The recommendations therefore support the Safer City and Sustainable City priorities.

## **Implications**

### **Financial**

46. Revenue and capital funding for Safety and Integrated Transport schemes in 2011/12 and following years is anticipated to be substantially reduced compared to previous budgets. In addition, under option 1 increased resources would be required to maintain the same level of service due to the withdrawal of the police from their current administration role. Dependent on the prioritisation of resources to this service it is likely that response times for speeding complaints will significantly increase. Resources will be focussed on areas, which deliver the best value for money in terms of casualty reduction.
47. Capital funding for 2011/12 will need to be identified for those sites scoring "3" under the criteria at **Annex A**, to progress any of the locations to be forwarded to Engineering, from both this report and the earlier 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010 report.

### **Human Resources (HR)**

48. There are HR implications, in that NYP are due to hand administration of the scheme to CYC, whilst this will not stop the scheme from running, because of the extra work load on the CYC officer, it is likely that the number of sites that can be investigated over a given period of time will reduce and there will be a "waiting list" of sites. It is already evident from this report, that there are a number of sites, still awaiting investigation; this is because of the current strain on workload felt on all three agencies involved in the Speed Review Process. There are also HR implications, if the scheme were extended to include evaluation after intervention was to be carried out, the current level of staff within the partnership would not be sufficient.

**Equalities** -- There are no equality implications.

**Legal** -- There are no legal implications.

### **Crime and Disorder**

49. Speeding is a criminal offence and the Council has a responsibility to deliver an effective Speed Management Strategy, however it is a Police responsibility to enforce the appropriate speed limit.

**Information Technology (IT)** -- There are no IT implications.

**Property** -- There are no property implications.

**Other** -- There are no other implications.

## Risk Management

50. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy the risks arising from the recommendations have been assessed, as below 16 and therefore require monitoring only.

### Strategic

51. There are no strategic risks associated with the recommendations of this report.

### Physical

52. Road accidents by their very nature are unpredictable and it is always possible that an injury accident will occur on a route that has been assessed where no action was taken. The data led method of assessing speeding issues ensures that routes with a casualty record are prioritised.

### Financial

53. It is now evident that demand for speed management treatments outweighs the capacity to deliver. All potential speed management administration and engineering treatments will be subject to budget allocation.

### Organisation/Reputation

54. There is likely to be opposition to a recommendation to take no action following the assessment of a speeding issue. However, the data led method of assessing speeding issues enables justification to be provided in instances when no action is deemed appropriate. With reduced allocations and increased administration workload it is possible that the level of service provided will be lower than the public's expectations leading to a risk that the council's reputation will suffer.

<b>Authors:</b>		<b>Chief Officer Responsible for the report:</b>			
Trish Hirst Road Safety Officer City Strategy 01904 551331  Tony Clarke Acting Head of Transport Planning City Strategy 01904 551641		Richard Wood Assistant Director (City Development and Transport)			
		<b>Report Approved</b>	✓	<b>Date</b>	20 December 2010
<b>Specialist implications Officer(s)</b>					
<b>Financial</b> Patrick Looker Finance Manager, City Strategy 01904 551633					
					<b>All</b>   <i>tick</i>
					✓
<b>For further information please contact the author of the report</b>					

## **Background Papers**

### **Speed Management Report**

Meeting of Executive Members for City Strategy and Advisory Panel, October 2006

### **Second Local Transport Plan 2006 –11**

(Including Road Safety Strategy and Speed Management Plan)

## **Annexes**

Annex A – Speed Review Criteria as set out in EMAP report October 2006.

Summary of options available

Annex B – Simplified diagram of protocol.

Annex C – Complaints form.

Annex D – List of sites, and data results.