

The Highland Council

Community Safety, Public Engagement and Equalities Committee 12 June 2014

Agenda Item	14
Report No	CPE 24/14

Scottish Safety Camera Programme Review – Response to Consultation Document

Report by Director of Community Services

Summary

This report provides the joint response made by the Northern Safety Camera Partnership, on behalf of its members, to the recent Government consultation on the Scottish Safety Camera Programme Review.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Highland Council is a member of the Northern Safety Camera Partnership, a body funded by Scottish Government and responsible for speed enforcement on the road network in Highland (including Trunk Roads) to reduce casualties and accidents. The Council's Head of Roads and Transport, Richard Evans, chairs the Partnership.
- 1.2 Throughout 2013 and early 2014 Transport Scotland has been reviewing with stakeholders the operation and structure of Safety Camera Partnerships to determine the optimum procedure, process and structure for its operational efficiency.
- 1.3 Following a wide ranging data and information gathering exercise covering all 8 Scottish Safety Camera Partnerships, Transport Scotland published a consultation document entitled Scottish Safety Camera Programme Review – Consultation Document, with a closing date for responses of 19 May 2014. This document may be viewed on the Scottish Government web site at :

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2014/02/2766/0>

2. Background

- 2.1 The Safety Camera Partnership was established in 2002 and brings together Police Scotland, Local Authorities, Transport Scotland, NHS Scotland, and the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service. Its purpose is to help reduce the number of people killed and seriously injured on Scotland's roads through targeted enforcement of speed limits.

2.2 The Safety Camera Programme Review focuses on two main areas:

a) **The outcome and functionality of the Safety Camera Partnership Partnerships**

To achieve Scottish Government 2020 casualty reduction targets there is a need to ensure the camera enforcement strategy is achieving maximum effectiveness. The review will consider criteria for monitoring sites and how best to make use of existing resources and latest technology. There is also a need to ensure consistency of approach throughout Scotland in both the rural and urban environment.

b) **Structure of the Safety Camera Partnerships**

Current partnership boundaries no longer align with the service delivery structures of the Crown office and Procurator Fiscal Service, nor with some NHS or Community Planning Partnership boundaries. The establishment of Police Scotland and their new road policing and specialist services provides an opportunity to review whether the existing partnerships offer the most effective and efficient structure to manage and operate the camera programme.

2.3 The principle of safety camera enforcement is not part of the review.

4 Council Response

4.1 The Safety Camera Programme should have more flexibility but still be focused on speed enforcement. Its resources should not be diluted by being diverted to other road safety initiatives. It can and should be able to respond to community concerns regarding speeding, including, for example, the part-time 20 mph limits in the vicinity of schools. This flexibility should not extend to whether or not particular speed limits are appropriate.

4.2 There is a lack of geographic alignment across a number of public service agencies and bodies with an interest in speeding offences and accident reduction. The Regional Transport Partnership boundaries throughout Scotland are reflective of common themes, issues and strategies across the transport network and this could be used as a model for any new camera partnership structure. This would cover finance and staffing where Local Authorities take it in turn to cover the governance and management issues within the partnerships and ensure that policies, processes and procedures align with Local Authority standard practice. This is especially relevant if the funding for the safety camera partnerships is to be channelled through perhaps a lead Local Authority within any new safety camera partnership structure.

4.3 The Partnership Managers are best placed to make deployment decisions although strategy and policy can be determined by the Management Boards who will also be able to monitor effectiveness.

4.4 The Council's joint response to the consultation as a member of the Northern Safety Camera Partnership is presented in **Appendix A**.

5 Implications

5.1 There are no Resource implications relating to this item since the safety camera partnership programme is funded entirely by Scottish Government.

5.2 There are no known Legal; Equalities; Climate Change/Carbon Clever; Risk or Gaelic implications arising from this report.

Recommendation

- i. Members are invited to homologate the Council's response to the Scottish Safety Camera Programme Review consultation document, as contained in **Appendix A**; and
- ii. To note that further comments received from Members at committee, even although these will be after the closing date, will be forwarded to Transport Scotland.

Designation: Director of Community Services

Date: 29 May 2014

Report Author R Evans / S MacNaughton / H Logan

Background Papers Scottish Safety Camera Programme Review – A Consultation Document.

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2014/02/2766/0>

Scottish Safety Camera Programme Review

Northern Safety Camera Partnership Response to Transport Scotland

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

PURPOSE AND REMIT OF SAFETY CAMERA PARTNERSHIPS

Question 1 - Do you consider that the existing remit as outlined above still reflects the fundamental requirement of the Safety Camera Programme or do you consider that it should be widened or given greater flexibility in its deployment?

We would like to see greater flexibility in Deployment Nationally, whilst sticking with the fundamental aims of the programme being evidence based retaining the focus on collision and casualty reduction. This view based on regular reviews of appropriate speed limits for the roads deployed on, with a possible change in how sites are assessed and monitored during the period of deployment. There has to be retained an effective and close working relationship through strong local management of resources with identified expending partners. We would like to see examples of where partnerships have been run effectively and efficiently replicated Nationally. We would also be looking at a possible increase in the current 15% Exception site rules or a change built into the site selection criteria that would deal with exception sites and core sites as one clear and transparent process. This we think should make the programme more publicly acceptable Scotland wide.

Question 2 - Changes in camera technology and other ongoing developments on the road network have created opportunities for the Safety Camera Partnerships to support enforcement activity in other areas such as Traffic Management Intelligent Transport System (ITS) schemes and at road works. Given the varying demands for camera enforcement how do we ensure there is flexibility to support enforcement activity without compromising the casualty reduction strategy?

We would like to see new camera technology embraced Nationally, but not at the expense of existing deployment. We must not lose sight of what the primary aim is focussed on, which should be Casualty Reduction. The new technology, example provided being the ITS programme on the M9 is designed primarily for congestion reduction, not casualty reduction, Enforcement at road works is designed to protect the workforce and prevent collisions with site vehicles and personnel. Both could be viewed as proactive solutions where there is no history of collisions. These should be financially supported in addition to existing funding to prevent dilution of the main purpose of the Scottish Safety Camera Programme. This will require either a change to the current main objectives of the programmes or an addition, costed and paid for separately that is managed through the Partnerships.

STRUCTURE OF SAFETY CAMERA PARTNERSHIPS

Question 3 - Which is your preferred safety camera partnership structure in order to deliver an effective and efficient Safety Camera Programme?

8 Separate Partnerships are not sustainable. We would support a National Partnership approach for consistency with a National Lead and a local management structure that provides strong support to the lead, effective partnership working and delivery of service at the point where it is required. The structure should take into account the geography of the area, the volume of traffic/collisions, the existing fixed camera infrastructure and where back office processes are currently located. Each back office hub should be adequately resourced with flexibility of staff working to ensure gaps can be filled when required. Attendance at court should be a consideration in deciding where back office hubs should be centred. This should provide the best of what is currently working well with some adjustments. Where replicated resources are currently working in close proximity to each other they could be merged to create a more efficient and effectively sized and managed resource. Other areas that cover vast geographical areas should, if they have not already done so, locate resources where there is a need to deliver the best possible local working solution for the area, thus ensuring minimal travel to maintain both the mobile and fixed camera network and maximising efficient service delivery.

Question 4 - Do you consider that there should continue to be a dedicated local communications resource for each Safety Camera Partnership or would a national communications team provide greater opportunities? If the resource is to remain within the programme what should the proposed structure look like?

We would support the retention of the communication resource moving towards a National lead supporting a locally based resource aligned with the new structure providing effective focussed delivery of National campaign lines.

Question 5 - Do you consider that there are functions that could be delivered by alternative methods?

We would be looking for a large deliverable benefit before consideration should be given [to] changing any method of delivery of individual functions. National and local functions currently work well. There may be efficiency benefits by making improvements to some aspects of process or sharing of resource for example: Data analyst role in some current partnership areas is shared with Police Scotland Trunk Roads Patrol Group/Division Traffic co-ordinating delivery of Partnership Deployment areas. This working arrangement could be rolled out to all areas to provide a joined up National Deployment Strategy linking the two main players ensuring that any gaps identified through the Safety Camera Programme can be proactively filled through the stronger local links thus created. This will ensure a more all round approach to Collision and Casualty reduction. Speed Awareness Courses could be introduced as a method educating the first offender motorist who exceeds the speed limit at a lower limit than is

currently enforced. The consensus of opinion remains that any change made should develop on what is already established and working well and be an improvement on that, and not a change for changes sake.

GOVERNANCE OF SAFETY CAMERA PARTNERSHIPS

Question 6 - The Scottish Safety Camera Programme is currently a standing agenda item for discussion by the Strategic Road Safety Partnership Board established under the Road Safety Framework to 2020. What, if any, role should the Board have in reviewing the performance of the Safety Camera Programme?

We suggest that the Scottish Safety Camera Programme should remain as a standing agenda item for discussion by the Strategic Road Safety Partnership Board. There should be one level of scrutiny to the programme. The Programme Office should, if the structure is created as suggested at **Q 3** with a National lead for the whole of Scotland be able to agree Key Performance indicators that fit in with the wider police framework our main partner in providing strategic direction in collision and casualty reduction. These would be fed down through the newly created management structure. This would ensure consistency across Scotland.

Question 7 – Each partnership has a local stand-alone Management Board or Steering Group established as required for consideration of funding through the programme and in terms of a local Service Level Agreement (SLA) or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). Is there a continuing need for local Management Boards or should it only be necessary to have local working groups to deal with practical issues such as site identification, site maintenance etc.?

If there is a continuing need, what functions should local management boards have responsibility for?

We suggest that if the set up is right as at **Q 6** as a possible alternative to the Local Management Board or Steering group, Working groups if not already in existence should be set up by the Partnership Manager with the expending partners, for example: - Transport Scotland represented by the Operating companies and representatives of the 32 Councils who have a role in all Road safety matters. Highland Road Safety Group as a local group example. There should continue to be a Service Level Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding that still deals with any legal issues involved with such an arrangement but the working group should deal with any day to day issues that require action. This would ensure a practical layer of management that would continue to ensure that in all areas of Scotland, Policy decisions that are made Nationally can then be implemented consistently with local service delivery, ensuring that the grant funding is disbursed equitably and used effectively in all areas not just the mainland where there is an identified requirement for service delivery. To achieve this equitable working arrangement the three council areas not currently provided with a service covering Shetland, Orkney and the Western Isles should be included.

Question 8 – Who should be responsible for making deployment decisions – the police, local management boards, or partnership managers

We understand that currently the Local Management Board or Steering group approves the Annual Operational Plan which includes in most cases how much deployment is forecast for the year. It is currently a decision of the Partnership Manager in conjunction with the Data Analyst to determine daily deployment levels and locations on the Roads Network. The Working Group assists the Partnership Manager in making decisions regarding site selection and removal of sites that are no longer suitable for deployment. There is already some local liaison between Safety Camera Partnerships and the Police Scotland locally working with Divisional and Trunk Roads Support Group Inspectors in Operational Support to ensure that deployment of camera resources compliments the work carried out by Police Scotland on the roads network. If there is a closer liaison as described at **Q 5** then the Partnership Managers would continue to manage deployment decisions co-ordinated more closely with Operational Roads Policing units. The main driver should be joined up thinking by all partners across Scotland for collision and casualty reduction.

Question 9 – How might the functions of the Local Management Team be provided in the future?

We suggest that if the structure is set up as described above with a locally based management team working closely with all the partners in whatever structure is determined to be the right size for each geographical area should sort out the management structure. You still require: - Managing all the functions of a Safety Camera Partnership locally reporting to the National Partnership Manager lead, information analysed and input locally reporting to the National Analyst lead, a level of local Media and communications input reporting to a National lead. This would enable the new set up to have a strong National lead with local consistent adherence to Policy.

ANY OTHER COMMENTS

Question 10

If you have any further comments on the purpose, structure and governance of safety camera partnerships not addressed by the previous questions, please submit these below.

We suggest that there needs to be a closer working relationship with all Partners who are involved in Collision and Casualty reduction. The working relationship as described in **Q 5** with Police Scotland could promote a more co-ordinated use of Safety Camera deployment resources. If your Analytical Products, Deployment processes along with improved Communications lines are right, then the publics perception should improve.