

Lancashire County Council

Internal Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the Meeting held on Friday, 13th November, 2020 at 10.00 am in Skype Virtual Meeting - Skype

Present:

County Councillor David O'Toole (Chair)

County Councillors

| | |
|--------------|-----------|
| M Salter | H Khan |
| T Ashton | P Rigby |
| P Britcliffe | P Steen |
| B Dawson MBE | D Whipp |
| J Fillis | G Wilkins |
| S Holgate | |

County Councillors Peter Britcliffe, Bernard Dawson and Hasina Khan replaced County Councillors David Foxcroft, Carl Crompton and Erica Lewis respectively.

1. Apologies

There were no apologies.

2. Disclosure of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

County Councillor David Whipp declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 4 as he was Chair of Pendle Community Safety Partnership.

County Councillor Peter Britcliffe declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5 as he was Chair of Lancashire County Council's Health Scrutiny Committee.

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 11 September 2020

Resolved: The minutes from the meeting held on 11 September 2020 were confirmed as an accurate record.

4. Speeding Traffic and the Lack of Enforcement

The Chair welcomed to the meeting County Councillor Keith Iddon, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport; Phil Durnell, Director of Highways and Transport; John Davies, Head of Service Highways; Michael White, Highway Regulation Manager; and Jackie Brindle, Safe and Healthy Travel Manager. Also welcomed to the meeting were Lara Jones, Central Process Unit Manager, Lancashire Constabulary and Hassan Khan, Superintendent, Lancashire Constabulary.

It was noted that at the last meeting of the Internal Scrutiny Committee members requested that the issue of speeding traffic and the lack of enforcement be considered as soon as possible.

A presentation from Highways and Transport officers was provided to the committee. The committee was informed that there was a growing perception that speeding levels had increased this year and this was reflected in the volume of complaints now being received by the Lancashire Road Safety Partnership. It was noted that excessive speed was a major concern and was a factor in some of the accidents in Lancashire's road network, however it was highlighted the number one factor for accidents in Lancashire was careless driver behaviour. There was not a one size fit all approach to road safety and different types of enforcement and education were required.

Speed was a key issue of the Lancashire Road Safety Partnership's Towards Zero Road Safety Strategy. The partnership began in 2001 and was a result of the Government's National Safety Camera Programme and had evolved over the years. The Lancashire Road Safety Partnership was a multi-agency approach and included all the relevant partners in Lancashire. A review of the partnership was about to be undertaken and would be led by the Police with input from all the other partner agencies. The Lancashire Road Safety Towards Zero Road Safety Strategy was explained to members and it was highlighted that tackling speed was a key element of the strategy.

The Road Safety Team was responsible for a number of key areas of work such as safety engineering schemes, speed management and speed limit setting and review. The team also deployed temporary signage and speed indicator devices around Lancashire.

Members were informed that the maintenance and replacement of the fixed camera casings were the responsibility of Lancashire County Council but the actual cameras were under the management of the police.

Through the Safer Roads Fund Programme the county council was looking to install 88 more average speed cameras across 5 different routes in Lancashire which had been considered to be amongst the most dangerous in the country. In addition to this there were other projects within the Safer Roads Fund Programme that were also ongoing across 5 different locations in the county.

In regards to speed management specifically, there was a number of ways the county council managed this and included speed assessments and data analysis, temporary signage and Speed Indicator Devices (SPIDs). There were a variety of different types of SPIDs and some collected speed data and others did not. The Road Safety Team was looking to review SPIDs and only use them when they were effective.

The team was also responsible for education and engaging with communities and schools around speeding and provided a range of resources to schools and parents about road safety. A community toolkit had been recently developed and

was available to all communities across Lancashire. Specific toolkits for primary schools and secondary schools were also available to support the whole school community and there was also a wealth of information available online.

To allow a single point of contact for reporting speed concerns there was a Speed Concern Submission page on the Lancashire Road Safety Partnership website which allowed members of the public to report concerns online. This was monitored by both the county council and the police and helped to avoid duplication and allowed residents to check whether the road in question was already been considered as an area of concern.

The following points and questions were raised by the committee:

- Regarding the cameras and the casings there was concern that local authority members were not given the opportunity to suggest where the cameras could be situated. It was also felt the cameras and the casings should be under the control of one authority rather than one authority owning the casings and another authority being responsible for the cameras. Members were informed that the county council along with the police had to look at where it was safe to put cameras and were governed by highway regulations and needed to adhere to the Department for Transport (DfT) rules. At the moment cameras and casings were a shared cost as this was the way it was initially set up. In the future, if areas were being considered for new housings and it was possible to consult Members about where they were being placed, feedback could be considered in line with the regulations.
- Members enquired if the use of average speed cameras had reduced the number of casualties on the routes where they were in use. Analysis had shown that these cameras had a significant and positive impact. In line with this it was commented that one of the most effective ways of reducing speed was through average speed cameras, it was requested whether more average speed cameras could be used to help reduce speed incidents. It was noted that the additional 88 cameras being provided through the Safer Roads Fund would be average speed cameras and they had been targeted for the most dangerous roads in Lancashire.
- There was a query about the effectiveness of the Lancashire Road Safety Partnership and a request to have statistics on the partnership since it had been established to see how effective it had been. It was highlighted in the initial years there had been a sharp drop in casualties and in more recent years this had plateaued off, reasons included improved vehicle safety. Officers were able to provide a profile of reduction in casualties since the partnership had formed. It was suggested that a fresh approach to the partnership could help to maintain a steady reduction in casualties and the upcoming review of the partnership was also likely to review and refresh the aims and targets of the partnership.

- It was noted that Members would often have to deal with frustrated residents in regards to reporting concerns about speeding through a website rather than being able to speak to someone directly. Members stated there had to be a more holistic approach with regards to dealing with complaints. The Road Safety team was looking to do more pro-active community focused work around all issues of road safety and was looking at more community work around all areas of road safety and this would include involvement from county councillors.
- The subject of 20mph zones was raised in regards to how effective they had been and whether there had been a reduction in casualties since they had been introduced. An analysis of this had taken place a couple of years ago, however this was still quite early on to analyse the data and provide a before and after comparison due to the limited amount of data. The analysis did show a slight reduction in all casualties. By next year it is hoped that there will be much more data to do a fuller analysis and comparison.
- Regarding speed limit reduction requests by elected members on behalf of their communities, members enquired if there could be an explanation as to why some of these requests had been turned down so this information could be shared with residents. Officers would feed this back to relevant officers to ensure enough feedback was provided.
- A concern was raised about accident records being inaccurate, as accidents were only recorded when there had been injuries and it was felt this was not a true reflection of the actual number of accidents. Concerns were also raised that information on near misses could not be factored into the statistics. The Road Safety Team was looking at the data that came from Lancashire Constabulary that recorded injury collisions. Through this data the team would look at the perception of risk in some areas which would pick up near misses and take some action with the concerns of the communities involved.

Colleagues from Lancashire Constabulary provided committee members with a verbal update on the issue of speeding traffic and the lack of enforcement. It was noted there was significant enforcement that was taking place, however it was acknowledged perhaps this needed to be communicated better.

The committee was informed about Operation Mantaray which was a daily speed enforcement operation carried twice daily by the police around six locations in Lancashire. Altogether there are 166 locations that have been identified and agreed by a number of different partners who work with the police. It was important to note that if a significant police incident occurred within Lancashire then police resources from Operation Mantaray could be redirected to support the incident.

It was noted that the police had a Safer Roads Team which was made up of special constables who supported road safety activity including speed enforcement and Operation Mantaray. All the constables were volunteers and the police relied on them.

The National Speed Enforcement operation took place earlier in the year from May to June 2020, during that period 1,235 tickets were processed for speeding. There was also project Edward (Every Day without a Road Death) that took place in September 2020 for a three week period, during this time 170 traffic notices were issued of which 50 were for speed offences. Further data was provided to committee members on driving offences.

It was noted that the constabulary had to suspend its mobile speed enforcement action between March and May 2020 when the first lockdown was introduced, as officers were redeployed to Covid related duties on the Lancashire Resilience Forum but this had now been fully reinstated.

The pandemic had a longer-term effect on the operation of the county's speed awareness courses due to the need for social distancing. An online course was now being offered nationally as an alternative.

Comments and questions raised by the committee were as follows:

- As councillors received the most complaints from residents about speeding it was felt that there were not many discussions with them from the police or the county council. Members enquired if there were any processes in place where the police could consult with councillors.
- There was an enquiry as to whether the county council had approached the police to get powers of enforcement delegated down to PCSOs or other officers who were relevantly qualified. Lancashire Constabulary were in the process of getting the special constables speed laser trained so they could stop vehicles and issue speeding offences without support from regular police officers.
- There was a request from the committee to Lancashire Constabulary for an update on the analysis of the data on Average Speed Cameras.

Resolved: The Internal Scrutiny Committee noted the presentations

5. Task and Finish Group Request - Health Scrutiny Committee

The report presented set out the request from the Health Scrutiny Committee for a task and finish group to be established to review the forthcoming proposals from the local NHS on the future of Chorley and South Ribble A&E.

Resolved: The Internal Scrutiny Committee approved the task and finish group request.

6. Work Planning 2020/21

This report presented provided information on the single combined work programme for all of the Lancashire County Council scrutiny committees.

There was a request for an analysis update on road safety to be presented at a future meeting of the Internal Scrutiny Committee.

Members were informed of two upcoming Bite Size Briefings. One on Winter Maintenance Services in Lancashire on 18 November and one on Visiting Arrangements in Care Settings during Covid-19 on 19 November.

Resolved: The Internal Scrutiny Committee noted the single combined work plan presented.

7. Urgent Business

There were no items of Urgent Business.

8. Date of Next Meeting

The next virtual meeting of the Internal Scrutiny Committee would take place on Friday 22 January 2020 at 10.00am.

L Sales
Director of Corporate Services

County Hall
Preston