

Scottish Safety Camera Programme Review

RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM

Please Note this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately.

We are inviting written responses by **19 May 2014**.

Please send your response with the completed form to:

safety.camerareview@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk

or

Scottish Safety Camera Programme
TRBO
8th Floor, Buchanan House
58 Port Dundas Road
Glasgow
G4 0HF

If you have any queries, please contact the Scottish Safety Camera Programme Office on 0141 272 7145.

RESPONDENT INFORMATION FORM

Please Note this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately.

1. Name/Organisation

Organisation Name

Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA)

Title Mr Ms Mrs Miss Dr **Please tick as appropriate**

Surname

Forename

2. Postal Address

RoSPA Scotland

Livingston House

43 Discovery Terrace, Heriot-Watt University Research Park

EDINBURGH scottishroadsafety@rospa.com

Postcode EH14 4AP

Phone 0131 449 9379

Email

3. Permissions - I am responding as...

Individual / **Group/Organisation**

Please tick as appropriate

- (a) Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site)?

Please tick as appropriate

Yes No

- (b) Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis

Please tick **ONE** of the following boxes

Yes, make my response, name and address all available

or

Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address

or

Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address

- (c) The name and address of your organisation **will be** made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site).

Are you content for your **response** to be made available?

Please tick as appropriate

Yes No

- (d) We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Please tick as appropriate

Yes

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?

The Safety Camera Programme in Scotland has since inception never appeared to suffer the same degree of negativity as its counterparts in England and Wales. With adherence to specific deployment criteria from the SCP Handbook the programme has justifiably held true to recommended deployment conditions.

To achieve the original purpose and remit of the SCP, the Programme should continue to focus on the need to reduce the number of people being killed and seriously injured on Scotland's roads. This may include expansion into new technology.

As an organisation we are of the opinion the Safety Camera Programme should embrace new technology but should consider carefully the negative impact deployments in locations where no supportive evidence exists within current criteria.

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?

The credibility of Safety Camera Programme in Scotland would suffer significantly if its resources were utilised simply as a congestion relieving solution on certain routes or deployed in areas where there is no collision history or threat of such. Utilising Intelligence Traffic Systems within the Programme is welcomed but only where it can meet the recognised criteria. The use of this technology to simply optimise traffic flow on any given route should not be undertaken under the banner of the SCP Programme. It could be held congestion in its self reduces the number of serious collisions. Such deployments should be separate from the programme and the rationale and governance of such deployments explained to our motoring public. Previous deployments under this guise attracted a fair amount of negative feedback.

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?

Local Authorities have a Statutory Duty to deliver casualty reduction in Scotland. Accordingly they are significant partners within the SCP Programme. Each individual Authority has specific and localised requirements under their existing Single Outcome Agreements. Whilst their individual casualty reduction focus may be similar, we are of the opinion a one size fits all approach may be counterproductive. There should be an element of localised or regionalised management autonomy on behalf of partnerships rather than a single Programme Management Unit for Operational issue needs. The remit of the current Scottish Safety Camera Programme Board should be reviewed along with the work and structure of individual partnerships.

Technology and linked administrative systems could provide overall governance which would negate alignment issues with Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Services.

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?

Strategic Communication statements on behalf of the Safety Camera Partnership(s) could and are at the current time covered by a single body such as The Programme Board or Transport Scotland. Safety Camera Partnerships should have an independent voice emphasising a localised casualty reduction aim and avoid confusion over a pure enforcement ethos. Localised Communication is important to Partners and the public. This could be produced by a partner but under the name and ethos of the Partnership.

There is a danger if all Communication statements are made through one partner, i.e Police Scotland, as suggested in your brief, the partnership element (other agencies involvement) would lose focus and profile. The emphasis may become perceived as one of enforcement/prosecution with all other areas being negated.

A meaningful and consistent Communications Programme within the Safety Camera Programme is vital to ensure their main objective of engendering a culture of speed awareness and detection of offenders is achieved.

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

SCP's currently undertake a number of casualty reduction programmes and interventions which are driven through their Communications' Teams. There is a degree of specialist knowledge required which would not be available through non dedicated Communication resources. Would this simply fall to the manager or other supervisory staff to create for others to drive the marketing? There is a case for reviewing the existing number of Communication Staff within the SCP's. With a significant numbers of partners wishing to retain a localised feel, perhaps a Regional template would work better, three of these to cover Scotland. This template may also suit the provision of Analytical support.

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?

It was our impression The Scottish Safety Camera Programme Office is the direct agent of Scottish Government and responsible for the Performance, Governance and overseeing localised activity within existing SCP's. The SRSPB meet infrequently and discuss numerous strategic issues. Involvement in the direction or Governance of the SCP would be counterproductive by introducing another management level. The SRSPB may identify developmental opportunities for SCP and could make recommendations to their future management structure or through existing channels of Scottish Government.

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?

The SCPs cannot function without the cooperation of Local Authorities and other key partners. The Management Board / Steering Group facilitate partner involvement, communication and provide localised accountability. They are of strategic importance to partners. Should this concept be dissolved, SCP may become isolated from Local Authorities and other key contributing partners. There may be scope to broaden the partnerships and provide a more Regionalised function to fewer individual SCP Units.

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

The Partnership Manager is currently accountable to the Partnership Board. The Partnership Manager should be responsible for ensuring deployments are undertaken in accordance with the guidance set out in the Handbook. Whilst all partners contribute, it should fall on the Partnership Manager to act in the interests of the group and progress the joint working.

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

Within the future of the Safety Camera Partnership there must be localised autonomy to reflect the needs of all partners. If this can be achieved in a single meaningful tier, good and well but in practice may lack management/supervisory resilience and accountable Health and Safety for all Staff especially in relation to mobile deployments.

Means of achieving effective efficiency savings should be explored in any review. These can often be achieved through common recording and data retrieval systems. Key areas such as performance, analysis and research could all be centralised as a result.

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.

Significant portions of the questionnaire focus on Communication and the role of the Communication Officer. Support for the work of SCP's is enhanced through their function being seen by the public as making a meaningful contribution to road safety and casualty reduction. This can only be achieved by conveying data supported messages in a positive way through appropriate outlets to maximise impact. It is suggested Analytical and Communications provision is key to ensure public support for SCP's in the future. Police Scotland are a key partner in all SCP's but are not and should not be the sole controlling influence. The needs of Local Authorities, their Single Outcome Agreements and Community Plans should be recognised. In the wake of recent media statements by some partners, questioning the role and perceived purpose of safety camera deployments, it essential the Partnership approach is retained whilst emphasising their casualty reduction role.

Please note the deadline for responses is 19 May 2014