
**Decision Session –
Cabinet Member for City Strategy**

01 December 2011

Report of the Cabinet Member for City Strategy

Speed Review Process Update Report

Summary

1. This report gives an update on the collaborative Speed Review Process, set up in York, in conjunction with the Police (NYP) and Fire Service (NYF&R). 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 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. It is of note that since the last update, North Yorkshire Police have introduced a Safety Camera, in the form of a mobile camera van on a trial basis, across the whole of North Yorkshire. The primary use of this vehicle is casualty reduction, but they have confirmed that any community requests for the camera van will ONLY be considered if they have gone through the Speed Review Process, which gives the evidenced required (to be totally transparent in camera operations) that the site is one of speeding violations.

Recommendations

4. The Cabinet Member for City Strategy is recommended to:

Agree Option 1 to support the continuation of a partnership approach to dealing with speed complaints.

Reason: This would result in, a wider, more in depth process to tackle speed issues in York.

Background

5. Speed Management, is a broad area, which encompasses a number of council departments and other agencies. The Speed Review Process is just one strand of speed management, which was agreed with Partners, to manage the specific area of speed complaints, of which the Council receives many from a number of sources including residents, elected members and representatives of local groups, such as resident associations. The process does not stand alone, but feeds into other processes, such as the current work to implement 20mph limits across the city, (being undertaken by the Policy and Modelling Team) and the review of speed limits (being undertaken by Network Management).
6. To help manage this, a data led method of assessing speeding concerns 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**. This criterion has been updated to include recent additions, such as the camera van and the CYC commitment to 20mph limits.
7. 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. This also provides greater flexibility to ensure officers can look across the board to make the most difference to casualty reduction and speed.
8. A simplified diagram of how the process works is shown at **Annex B**.
9. The form for reporting issues is available on the council web site and is reproduced at **Annex C**. Casualty reduction is a key target for the Partnership.
10. For general information, the last 3 years (to end of 2010) Killed and Seriously injured statistics for York, including the figures for 2001 as a guide, are shown in the table below.

KSI	2001	2008	2009	2010
Pedestrians	19	20	10	11
Pedal Cyclists	21	17	11	14
Motor Cyclists	24	22	11	16
Car Occupants	44	36	25	18
Other	11	0	3	3
Total	119	95	60	62

11. The table shows that there is a marked decrease in KSI from 119 in 2001 to 60 in 2009, with a slight upward variation to 62 in 2010.
12. The table also makes it evident, that whilst we have seen an overall general downward trend the biggest decreases in KSI's has been in car occupants.
13. Slight injury statistics for York, for the last 3 years (to end of 2010), including figures for 2001 as a guide, are shown in the table below.

Slight	2001	2008	2009	2010
Pedestrians	78	57	67	55
Pedal cyclist	110	106	122	109
Motor cyclist	77	61	47	66
Car Occupant	443	250	283	248
Others	65	31	38	19
Total	773	505	557	497

14. Again, it can be seen that whilst there is an overall reduction, the biggest reduction is again in injured car occupants.
15. 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".
16. There are no locations, of the 61 investigated within this report period (Jan – Aug 2011) 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**).
17. 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.

Consultation

18. As part of the Speed Review Process all locations were visited and risk assessed by CYC & Police Officers.
19. 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.£250 - £300 each to undertake, the input of these resources by Partners helps to investigate community concerns in greater detail.
20. CYC 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).
21. 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

22. From the last report in January 2010 there have been a total of 61 locations investigated.
23. All are documented in **Annex D**, along with any results from investigations.
24. **Category 1 (high speeds and high accidents)** - None of the current complaints investigated fall within the category 1 criteria.
25. **Category 2 (low speeds and high accidents)** - None of the current complaints investigated fall within the category 2 criteria.
26. **Category 3 (high speeds and low accidents)** - All sites that have scored category 3, under the criteria at **Annex A**, have been forwarded to Transport Projects for consideration; with the exception of the B1222 at Naburn, which is a key casualty reduction, (Anvil) enforcement route for NYP along its whole length, which includes Naburn. The issues on this road relate particularly to motorbikes and it is considered, at this current time, that enforcement is the most cost effective casualty reduction tool.

27. It must be noted however, that this engineering list totals 41 sites; as it also includes outstanding sites (that also scored a category 3) in the last two update report, Jan 11 and July 10. These have not been considered until now, due to the lack of resources within the team arising from the current economic climate and staff restructuring. Keeping the sites in a single category provides officers with the greatest flexibility to be able to look across the board at where we can make the most difference to casualty reduction and speed. See **Annex E** for current engineering list.
28. As the allocated budget is currently 20k, it is highly likely that after feasibility, only a very limited number of sites may actually see the implementation of cost effective speed reduction measures.
29. Locations will be assessed and prioritised under the below criteria:-
 - a. Accident data
 - b. Mean/ 85th percentile and the percentage over the posted limit.
 - c. Proximity to schools and shops.
30. It is likely that those sites, rated as a category 4 and that fall within the area for a proposed new 20mph limit will be put on hold until the new limits are in place, and evaluation of resulting speeds has taken place.
31. For information **Annex F**, is a spreadsheet which outlines the **past** locations that have been forwarded to Transport Projects since the Speed Review process has been in place and where cost effective speed reduction measures have been identified and implemented.
32. Several of the category 3 sites have also been identified, from the data, as suitable for Police enforcement and this information has been passed to local policing teams and the NYP camera operations team.
33. Currently on the Enforcement list forwarded from the Speed Review Process, (York Selby, Tadcaster Area) there are a total of 50 locations for “targeted enforcement” (at a time evidenced by the data that there are high numbers of speeding vehicles).
34. Of these 50 locations, 34 are within the York area and these will be enforced either by the local Policing teams or by the new NYP camera van see **Annex G**. This enforcement is over and above that undertaken by NYP at existing casualty locations/routes across the county.

35. Many of these sites have been on the list since the Partnership scheme started in 2009 and thus as more join the list, those that have been on the longest will be removed so the list will slowly vary over time.
36. It is of note that the idea of enforcement at these locations is NOT to issue speeding tickets, but to educated drivers, thus information on issue of tickets at each individual location is not available, however local Policing teams will feed back at Ward/Parish meeting as and when enforcement has taken place (NYP camera operation updates are feely available on the NYP website). Police intelligence suggests that a high number of those captured are York residents.
37. **Category 4 (low speeds and low accidents)** - All sites that have scored category 4 under the criteria at **Annex A**, have been evaluated according to the data. Most have been offered the SID (mobile speed indicator device) scheme (see Annex A for details). However, because of the evidence in the data, some have been forwarded to Transport Projects, review of speed limit, enforcement or marked for no further action, at this current time.
38. The SID scheme was first used successfully in Leeds and was subsequently implemented in York, to provide an ideal “education” solution, to sites where residents had localised concerns about speeding, but where the data did not evidence a speeding issue. It is only ever used (in York) as an “education tool by communities” (and not directly as a speed reduction measure).
39. The Speed Review Scheme successfully enables officer’s time and resources to be targeted at locations with real speed and accident issues. Where there is no evidenced speed issue, but where local communities want to take action to educate drivers in their area, the Council will continue to offer SID.

Update on other related issues

40. **Council Web Site** - All the information on the Speed Complaint Process, including the criteria, complaint form and a “frequently asked questions” section in now available on the City of York Council web site at the below address.

www.york.gov.uk/transport/Roadsafety/Roadsafetycampaigns/ReportingSpeedingConcerns/

41. **Police Enforcement** – From January 2011 the scheme was no longer regarded as a “Pilot” by NYP. NYP have also given notice 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.
42. This is to take place when the Speed Review Process is rolled out across North Yorkshire County Council. It was due to happen in early 2011, but inconsistencies in approach across the County and the introduction of the NYP camera van has delayed this, with a new proposed date for County wide agreement in January 2012.
43. The new NYP managed camera van is now operational and may be used, along with more traditional Police methods for enforcement.
44. It is of note that the placing of the camera van is completely at the discretion of NYP, whose current policy is that all requests from the community, for the camera van will be processed through the Speed Review Process and with due regard to their operational requirements. Information on the sites due to be visited by the camera van and feed back can be found at the following address.

www.northyorkshire.police.uk/safetycamera

Options

45. **Option 1** - To continue with the Speed Review Process, in Partnership with the Police and Fire Service. This gives a pool of resources and expertise that ensures speed concerns are managed and prioritised using a data led method.
46. **Option 2** - To revert back to our own, independent, but smaller process, this 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 Police would no longer support our complaints procedure with the Mobile Safety Camera Van.

Analysis

47. Option 1, enables us to fully investigate and collect data on most speed issues 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.

48. 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.

Council Plan

49. The Council Plan aim's 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** - Revenue and capital funding for speed reduction schemes in 2011/12 and following years could be reduced compared to previous budgets, even with Local Sustainable Transport Funding helping in other areas. In addition, under option 1 increased resource 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.
- **Human Resources (HR)** – 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 that a number of sites have waited a long time for investigation; this is because of the current strain on workload felt on all three agencies involved in the Speed Review Process.

- **Equalities** – There are no equality implications.
- **Legal** – There are no legal implications.
- **Crime and Disorder** - 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 as per the DfT guidelines and Road Traffic Law.
- **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.
51. **Strategic** - There are no strategic risks associated with the recommendations of this report.
52. **Physical** - 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.
53. **Financial** - 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.
54. **Organisation/Reputation** - 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.

Authors:	Chief Officer Responsible for the report:		
Trish Hirst Road Safety Officer City Strategy 01904 551331	Richard Wood Assistant Director (City Development and Transport)		
	Report Approved	√	Date 14.11.11
Specialist implications Officer(s)			
Financial			
Patrick Looker Finance Manager, City Strategy 01904 551633			
Wards Affected:			All ✓
For further information please contact the author of the report			

Annexes

- Annex A – Criteria paper
- Annex B – Flow chart of process (simplified)
- Annex C – Speed Concern Report Form
- Annex D – Excel sheet of all locations and conclusions
- Annex E – List of sites forwarded to Transport Projects (current).
- Annex F – List of past sites, identified via the process for engineering
- Annex G – Speed enforcement locations – from the Speed Review Process

Background Documents

ACPO Uniformed Operations Policing the Roads 5yr Strategy 2011 - 2015