

## **Decision Session - Executive Member for City and Environmental Services 12 November 2015**

Report of the Acting Director City and Environmental Services

### **Part 1: Speed Review Process**

#### **Summary**

1. This report gives an update on the collaborative Speed Review Process, set up under the 95 Alive Partnership, in conjunction with North Yorkshire Police (NYP) and North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYF&R) and the Council Road Safety & Engineering Projects Teams. This ensures that resident's speed concerns are considered, and where feasible, interventions are implemented.
2. The report advises of locations from 2013, 2014 & 2015 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 also addresses a petition received by the Council on 27 August 2015 from residents of Cranbrook Road concerning speeding vehicles along that road.

#### **Background**

4. 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 other 95 Alive Partners to ensure speed complaints are appropriately managed.
5. The Partnership receives a high number of speed related concerns, from a number of sources. The process does not stand alone, but feeds into other processes, such as casualty reduction, danger reduction, safe routes to school, setting of speed limits etc.
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 national criteria. The criteria for assessment are shown within Annex A. This criteria was updated in 2012 to include additions, such as the NYP camera van and the implementation of signed only 20mph limits across the city.

7. In the past (pre- 2008) these complaints were responded to by individual agencies, Police, Fire Service or CYC but this resulted in mixed messages to the public and a big overlap of work that was neither cost effective or consistent.
8. By working together in partnership, resources, knowledge and expertise have been pooled to fully investigate all concerns raised. This also provides greater flexibility to ensure Partnership Agencies can look across both the City and the County to make the most difference to casualty reduction and speed.
9. A simplified diagram of how the process works is shown at Annex B. The form for reporting issues is available on the CYC council web site and NYP website and is reproduced at Annex C.
10. Most recently (2015) there has been a move to streamline the process across all areas of the 95 Alive Partnership (City of York & North Yorkshire County Council area). This has included a more proactive role being taken by the Police & Crime Commissioner's Office. As a partnership we moved over to a new administration process and new name on 26th October 2015. The process is now known as the Speed Management Protocol (SMP). This is to help stream line the process across all Agencies and the City and County.
11. In York members of the public will see no difference in the reporting process, but it is planned to have an area on the Traffic Bureau web site where all the results of investigations, across both the City and County, will be available for the public to see. It is also anticipated that a new electronic form and submission process will soon be available which will be a positive move for residents in the City of York. (There is a already a downloadable form on the CYC & NYP web sites)
12. Casualty reduction is a key target for the Partnership. For general information, the last 3 years (to end of 2014) Killed and Seriously Injured (KSI) statistics for York, including the average 3 year figures from 2002-04 as a guide, are shown in the table below.

<b>KSI</b>	<b>02-04. 3yr avg</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
Pedestrians	21	18	14	16
Pedal Cyclists	9	11	15	21
Motor Cyclists	25	15	9	13
Car Occupants	49	5	18	22
Other	7	2	2	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>75</b>

13. The table shows that there is a downward trend in KSI in all categories except for cycle casualties. The increase in cycle casualties can be, to some extent, explained by the correlating increase in cyclists in the city. There has been a 20% rise in cycle activity in the city over the last 10 years, with as much as half of that rise being evident between 2013 to 2014. Never the less, the increase in cycling casualties is of concern.
14. Slight injury statistics for York, for the last 3 years (to end of 2014) including the average 3 year figures from 2002-04 as a guide, are shown in the table below.

<b>Slight</b>	<b>02-04. 3yr avg</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
Pedestrians	67	62	59	59
Pedal cyclist	117	128	133	170
Motor cyclist	102	46	50	62
Car Occupant	381	217	202	201
Others	53	20	19	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>508</b>

15. It is of note that the rise in “slight cycling accidents” between 2013 - 2014 is statistically significant. As above this is explained to some extent by the rise in cycle activity. More work is ongoing to look in detail at what is happening and how these increases can be re-addressed.
16. Continued assessment over 8 years, of resident speed concerns via the evidence led process has highlighted that the locations that are of most concern to residents in terms of perceived speeding, are usually directly outside their property and rarely have a related casualty problem. This

suggests that a lot of community concerns around speed are of perceived risk - “accidents waiting to happen”.

17. Annex D shows all the sites reported in 2013, 2014 & 2015 and progress to date. A total of 76 sites listed.

For 2013 there are 25 sites with 2 outstanding. (Road/bridge works which prevented the site being investigated)

For 2014 there are 21 sites with 13 outstanding.

For 2015 there are 30 sites with 30 outstanding.

18. Sites outstanding are waiting for 7 day x 24 hour speed data to be taken. These have been outstanding for so long because the Partnership data logging equipment has gradually over the last few years begun to fail. This has seen a back log of sites awaiting data collection, with no identified budget for us to be able to replace failing equipment.
19. The Partnership has been working hard to address the issue of the failing equipment. Funding was identified last year, by North Yorkshire Police Crime Commissioner, from income generated from speed fines to allow the Partnership to purchase new speed recorder equipment for the whole Partnership across North Yorkshire County Council & York areas.
20. Collection of data with the new equipment started across the County in July 2015; however as can be expected with the roll out of new equipment and processes, there have been a number of teething problems. These have gradually been resolved; with NYF&R now confirming that work to collect the back log of speed data is now underway.
21. To give an overview of the scale of the issues there are outstanding 160 sites across York & North Yorkshire (45 in York) which are now awaiting speed data collection.
22. NYF&R confirmed that 14 of those sites (NYCC area) had been collected and that they hoped to address all other outstanding sites as soon as possible.
23. In spite of the above, speed investigations consistently conclude that all locations of resident concern appear to be sites where there are no or few speed related casualties. This means that in terms of prioritising work load, speeding concerns generally have a lower priority than casualty reduction work for all agencies involved. 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 can reduce the chances of a collision occurring, and the severity of resulting casualties.

### **Consultation**

24. As part of the Speed Review Process all locations were visited and risk assessed by CYC Road Safety & NYP Traffic Management Officers.
25. NYF&R, on behalf of the Partnership, undertake speed surveys in areas identified as not having an injury issue, but where there are resident concerns about speed. If the Council were to undertake these speed surveys the cost would be between £100 - £300 each to undertake, thus the input of these resources by Partners is a valuable contribution.
26. It is important to reiterate that independently of the Speed Review Process, CYC will continue to fund speed surveys, as priority at sites, such as those highlighted as “high” accident locations. This is as part of the ongoing commitment to reduce casualties. However, as stated above, there are none of these sites identified in this report.
27. Once speed surveys are returned, these are analysed by the Partnership team, against the criteria to determine what, if any further action would be appropriate. (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**

28. This report covers all the locations which have been reported between November 2012 and September 2015. All are documented in year marked pages on Annex D, along with any results from investigations.
29. **Category 1 (high speeds and high accidents)** - None of the current complaints investigated fall within the category 1 criteria.
30. **Category 2 (low speeds and high accidents)** - None of the current complaints investigated fall within the category 2 criteria.
31. **Category 3 (high speeds and low accidents)** – The category 3 sites shown at Annex D, have all been forwarded onto the Projects Team with more information in Part 2 of this report, the Review of Speed Management Engineering Programme, with the exception of the 2 sites below where investigations concluded too late for them to be included in the engineering list:-

- Wigginton Road 14 91 0 020
- Fishergate 13 91 0 150

These 2 locations will be passed to the (Council Engineering) Project Team for consideration of further cost effective speed reduction measures for inclusion in this year's budget if possible, or carried over to next year.

32. It is of note that a number of the sites that have been identified for engineering feasibility, are in existing 20mph speed limits, which may be an indication that some signed only 20mph speed limits need physical traffic calming to ensure compliance.
33. The Transport Capital Programme includes a funding block for Speed Management, for schemes at sites identified via this process. This is discussed in the Review of Speed Management Requests to Engineering report.
34. Locations proposed for physical speed reduction measures will be assessed and prioritised under the following criteria:-
  - Accident data
  - Mean/ 85<sup>th</sup> percentile and the percentage over the posted limit. (**see Annex A**)
  - Proximity to schools and shops.
35. **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. Where appropriate the SID (speed indicator device) scheme has been offered to residents (see Annex A for details)
36. 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 has not evidenced a speeding issue. It is only used (in York) as evidenced via the speed review process as an "education tool by communities" (and not directly as a speed reduction measure).

### **Police Enforcement**

37. The current community concern Police enforcement list from the Speed Review Process, (York / Selby / Tadcaster Area) is at Annex E. This enforcement is over and above that undertaken by NYP at existing casualty locations/routes across the county.

38. It is of note that the idea of enforcement at these locations is NOT to issue speeding tickets, but to educate 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 freely available on the NYP website). Police intelligence suggests that a high number of those captured are York residents.
39. The NYP managed camera van may be used, along with more traditional Police methods for enforcement.
40. 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 SMP 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](http://www.northyorkshire.police.uk/safetycamera)
41. The NYP managed camera van operation has steadily been expanding over the last three years and now has six mobile camera vans, which operate across the whole of North Yorkshire and York and may be used, along with more traditional Police methods for enforcement.

#### **Petition from Residents of Cranbrook Road.**

42. Cranbrook Road is a signed only 20mph speed limit on a residential street. A petition of over 200 names was presented at the Executive meeting on 27 August 2015 by Cllr Stuart Barnes/Lead Petitioner Paul Williams. The petition states:-  
  
*“We the undersigned petition the Council to build speed ramps or bollards on the street of Cranbrook Road, York because of motorists speeding continuously beyond 20 mph. We the residents are concerned for our children’s safety on these roads”.*
43. A Speed Review Concern Form was received, from Mr Williams and was acknowledged by the Partnership on 15 July 2015. Investigation of casualty data has been carried out, and there have been no casualty road traffic collisions (RTC’s) in the last 6 years at Cranbrook Road. (01/01/2009 to 31/05/2015).
44. A site assessment was undertaken on 23 September 2015.

45. The location is one of the 45 outstanding sites that are now with NYF&R awaiting 7 day x 24hr speed data.
46. It is noted that Mr Williams had written to his MP, Rachael Maskell on several occasions prior to submitting a Speed Concern Report form to the Partnership, and all letters from Rachael Maskell MP were responded to fully by NYP and CYC advising of the Partnership approach.
47. Cranbrook Road will be subject to the same criteria for action as all other community concerns and the conclusions, once reached will be shared with Mr Williams, Rachael Maskell MP and Cllr Stuart Barnes.

### **NYP Community Speed Watch**

48. In March 2015 NYP began a 6 month trial of an initiative that has run in other areas by Police called Community Speed Watch. This gives local communities, with the help of Police Volunteers, the opportunity to undertake an educational type “enforcement” scheme, where those found speeding are sent an official letter asking them to consider their actions. There is no formal ticket or prosecution.
49. As the scheme was a pilot, it took slightly different forms in different areas – but in the City of York, the scheme was trialled in a very similar format to the already existing SID scheme, and the City of York sites picked for the trial were all category 4 sites as identified via the SMP.
50. The pilot has now concluded, and an internal NYP Decision Notice written. It is understood that NYP Community Speed Watch will resume at Easter 2016, in a new style to take consideration of the finding from the pilot. For members of the public, requests to implement Community Speed Watch on their street will be via the SMP. This ensures the site is investigated and evidenced as suitable for the intervention.

### **Options**

51. **Option 1** – To agree with the findings and recommendations of the report, to continue to work in Partnership to give a cost effective, and evidence led solution to provide the appropriate level of investigation to community speed concerns.
52. **Option 2** – To leave the Partnership and independently (as CYC only) respond to residents concerns about speeding.

## **Analysis**

53. Option 1, would acknowledge the update and information in the report and agree to continue to investigate community speed concerns, as raised by individuals, via this data led method of assessing speed complaints. This process is part of the 95 Alive Partnership (run across York and North Yorkshire Council areas) and facilitates a continuation of NYP input and enforcement activity, where appropriate and NYF&R inputting time and staff hours in the collections of speed data.
54. The inputs and joint working of the partnership provide a large cost saving to the Council and ensure a jointly identified priority list for speed reduction measures within the constraints set by budgets and the Department for Transport (DfT) guidance for the posted speed limit.
55. Option 2, To leave the Partnership would leave CYC in a difficult position in terms of investigating these none/low accident issues. Collection of speed data for such sites is likely to be restricted by funding constraints. It is also likely that collaborative work with NYP in terms of enforcement and requests for the safety cameras could be challenging without clear evidence led process. Thus leaving the Partnership would not be beneficial for CYC or the residents who are raising concerns about speeding.

## **Council Plan**

56. The Plan is built around 3 key priorities:
  - A Prosperous City For All.
  - A Focus On Frontline Services.
  - A Council That Listens To Residents
57. Speeding traffic is a common complaint from residents. Measures that are provided from the Local Transport Plan funding or through Ward Committees or Parish Councils provide a way to address these issues. Promoting the Speed Indicator Device (SID) gives communities, where it is evidenced as appropriate, the tools to help themselves to make a difference.

## Implications

- **Financial** - Revenue and capital funding for speed reduction schemes in 2015/16 are set, thus potential measures will need to be prioritised.
- **Human Resources (HR)** - As anticipated, the reduced officer resources to this service, has seen a lengthening in the response times for speeding complaints. Resources will be focussed on areas, which deliver the best value for money in terms of casualty reduction.
- **Crime and Disorder** - Speeding is a criminal offence and the Council has a responsibility to deliver an effective Speed Management Strategy. It is a Police responsibility to enforce the appropriate speed limit as per the DfT guidelines and Road Traffic Law.
- **Information Technology (IT)** - It is anticipated that the reporting procedure will become electronic, but in order to work successfully across 3 or more organisations will take manpower and funds the Partnership continues to work towards this goal.
- There are no **equalities, legal, property** or **other** implications.

## Risk Management

58. 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.
59. Strategic - There are no strategic risks associated with the recommendations of this report.
60. 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.
61. 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.
62. 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 where 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.

### Recommendations

63. That the Executive Member is asked to approve option 1, to agree with the findings and recommendations of the report as a cost effective, and evidence led solution to provide the appropriate level of investigation to community speed concerns.

Reason: So that all locations identified, from past reports as well as this current report, are considered for appropriate speed reduction measures on clear and equal guidelines.

### Contact Details:

**Author:**

**Trish Hirst**  
**Road Safety Officer**  
**Sustainable Transport**  
Tel No. 01904 551331

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

**Neil Ferris**  
**Acting Director CES**

**Report**  
**Approved**

**Date** 27/10/15

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)**

Financial  
Patrick Looker  
Finance Manager  
Tel No. 01904 551633

**Wards Affected:** List wards or tick box to indicate all

**All**

**For further information please contact the author of the report**

## **Background Papers:**

- i) Meeting of the Executive Member for City Strategy and Advisory Panel on 30 October 2006.
- ii) Report to the Executive Member for City Strategy Decision Session on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2012.

## **Annexes**

- Annex A – Criteria paper
- Annex B – Flow chart of process (simplified)
- Annex C – Speed Concern Report Form
- Annex D – Speed site list and data summary
- Annex E – NYP enforcement list