

# Tackling the Deficit: At what cost to road safety?

Eleanor Besley (PACTS)

October 2010

Report Number 11/02



**The RAC Foundation has commissioned a number of external experts to write a series of think pieces and occasional papers throughout the course of 2010/11. This paper is about *Tackling the Deficit: At what cost to road safety?* and is report number 11/02.**

The Royal Automobile Club Foundation for Motoring Ltd is a charity which explores the economic, mobility, safety and environmental issues relating to roads and responsible road users. Independent and authoritative research, carried out for the public benefit, is central to the Foundation's activities.

RAC Foundation  
89-91 Pall Mall  
London  
SW1Y 5HS

Tel no: 020 7747 3445  
[www.racfoundation.org](http://www.racfoundation.org)

Registered Charity No. 1002705  
October 2010 © Copyright Royal Automobile Club Foundation for Motoring Ltd

This report has been prepared for the RAC Foundation by Eleanor Besley, Policy and Research Officer for the Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS). The report content is the view of the author and their organisation. It does not necessarily represent the views of the RAC Foundation.



## Contents

<b>Foreword</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Methodology</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Auditing the Sector – Key Resources</b>	<b>4</b>
Data	4
Evidence and Knowledge Sharing	4
Funding	5
Partnerships	5
Strategy and Targets	6
<b>Auditing the Sector – Structural Weaknesses</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Creating a Vacuum – What’s the Context?</b>	<b>9</b>
<i>Tomorrow’s Roads</i> Draws to a Close	9
The Coalition Government	10
The Emergency Budget	12
<b>Perceptions are Real – The Impact of the Emergency Budget</b>	<b>14</b>
Road Safety, a Priority?	14
Research Gap	15
The Great Speed Camera Debate	16
<b>Comprehensive Spending Review – More With Less; But How?</b>	<b>17</b>
Working with Coalition Values - Whose Job is it Anyway?	17
Strategy	20
Community Engagement	21
Evidence-Focused Working	22
Partnerships	23
Research Priorities	23
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex A: Key Road Safety Evidence Resources</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>28</b>

## Foreword

Road safety is at a crossroads. It has entered a policy vacuum and urgent action is now needed to ensure Great Britain continues to reduce road deaths and casualties beyond 2010.

The change in political administration, a hard-line focus on reducing public spending at both national and local levels, and the end of the current road safety strategy has resulted in a natural pause in policy which is fast being filled with the perception that road safety is no longer a priority for national government. The Government needs to move quickly to ensure that Great Britain's road safety record is not damaged beyond repair.

Road safety professionals have been left dealing with significant fallout from ministerial announcements and the emergency budget which took place in May 2010. Even though cuts were made to allow for the greatest flexibility in local areas there was little discussion with local government on how to provide continued funding for road safety activity. Although the Secretary of State explained when giving evidence to the Transport Select Committee that spending decisions should be made locally, the evidence collected for this report suggests that government has failed to communicate this widely. Significant cuts in local road safety budgets, resources and staffing have been the result. The Government's 'localism' agenda, and the ministerial team's commitment to 'ending the war on the motorist' has also caused great confusion amongst practitioners, a misunderstanding which still needs to be resolved.

Despite the difficulties experienced in the aftermath of the emergency budget, change provides as much of an opportunity as it does a challenge. Whilst the road safety profession remains concerned for the future of the industry, many are buoyed by the hope that this pause in activity will provide an opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of what is delivered in the name of road safety.

The Coalition Government's focus on local action allows spending decisions to be made at the most appropriate level and any existing duplication of local resources can be reduced by providing national frameworks which provide local areas with the ability to share information, intelligence and materials. In this new world national government will facilitate rather than direct by providing a national backbone of resources, which enables practitioners to deliver programmes and initiatives to communities with confidence. In analysing data trends and research conclusions for local practitioners to use, national Government will in essence work as 'analyst' for local government and their communities. A dialogue is now needed between these two levels of administration to develop this new working relationship.

For those who are wary of the ability for 'localism' with national support to deliver road safety improvements, they should take heart in that Great Britain's road safety success has been built upon local action, with the support of national targets. There is no reason why the 'good' aspects of past working cannot be repeated beyond 2010.

Road safety is not historically an area of policy where Whitehall has sought to control the Town Hall. The consistent improvement in road safety since 1987 has been the result of partnership working between central and local government, the police service, the fire service, the private sector, the third sector and professional bodies. The setting of a casualty reduction target in 1987 and again in 2000 has provided a common goal at which to aim and a benchmark against which progress could be measured. The successes of the past and the role a national vision and framework played within this should not be forgotten.

If central government does not grasp the nettle by setting a national strategy, developing new working relationships between national and local government, and continuing research activity in areas such as the in-depth accident study, Britain's leading international reputation for road safety performance will be under threat. Inaction may well lead to a stabilisation or increase in road casualties, but it could also reduce the UK's export value through reducing the nation's recognised road safety knowledge, experience and services.

The inevitable need to change has to be embraced rather than avoided. If done right Britain can continue to be a leading player in the international road safety field. The Comprehensive Spending Review outcomes will add to the pressure local authorities and their partners already face in keeping their costs down and delivering more with less. It is essential that national government sets the framework for future working and provides the tools that practitioners need to deliver improvements in these financially constrained times without delay.

In addition to the human tragedy of death and injury on our roads, accidents cost the country dear in economic terms. Properly evaluated safety initiatives provide extremely good value for money. This should be reason enough for Government to give the support needed to road safety practitioners and remind people that road safety matters even in times of financial austerity.



Robert Gifford

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Robert Gifford".

Executive Director  
PACTS



Stephen Glaister

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "S. Glaister".

Director  
RAC Foundation

## Introduction

The Department for Transport (DfT) reported a total of 2,222 deaths in road collisions in Great Britain in 2009. Additionally, 24,690 people were reported seriously injured and 195,234 slightly injured to the police. 6 people were killed and 68 people were seriously injured every day on British roads<sup>1</sup> – a daily toll of almost the same number who were killed and injured in the high-profile Potter's Bar rail crash of 2002.

Although it is generally assumed that nearly all deaths are reported to the police, it has long been known that a significant number of non-fatal injuries are not recorded. For the last two years, the Department has brought together a range of data sets in order to gather a more accurate picture of the level of serious injury on British roads. The current best estimate from DfT based on data available from Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) the National Travel Survey (NTS) and the British Crime Survey (BCS) is that there are actually around 700,000 non-fatal casualties from collisions each year, including 80,000 serious injuries – three times as many as are reported to and by the police each year.

The total value of prevention of reported road accidents in 2009 was estimated to be £15.8 billion.<sup>2</sup> This value includes the cost of damage only collisions but does not account for the under-reporting of injury accidents. Based on the estimates above, and assuming that 51,000 serious and 304,000 slight accidents did not appear in 2009 police data and that the average value of prevention would be the same for unreported accidents, the total value of prevention would be closer to £30 billion<sup>3</sup>, or around 1.8 per cent of GDP.<sup>4</sup> The argument to improve road safety is therefore not simply ethically, socially and emotionally driven but also an economically sound policy area that will deliver real cost savings. As we reach the end of 2010, road safety is entering new territory and the need to work effectively to reduce the level of death and injury on our roads is extremely high.

The economic and political environment within which road safety is to exist is changing. It is an appropriate time to look objectively at the sector as a whole, identify the range of resources employed and highlight structural weaknesses before looking in detail at the impact of evolving conditions. This report forms the first of a two part series written by the Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety (PACTS) on behalf of the RAC Foundation. The aim of this series is to establish:

- The impact of road safety cuts on research and practice at the national and local level; and
- The research and practice gaps that will need to be filled to ensure that the UK maintains or improves its road safety record.

This first report analyses the impact of emergency budgets for 2010/2011 on the road safety sector and makes recommendations which encourage best use of road safety funding within the context of budget cuts expected following the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) in October 2010. The second report will review the outcomes of the CSR and establish what impact spending cuts have had on the road safety environment.

## **Methodology**

Research for this report has involved a combination of desk-based analysis, surveys and in-depth interviews with academics and practitioners as well as focus group meetings with professionals in the field. In total 72 individuals were consulted during the research including representatives from Local Highway Authorities (officers and members), Police Forces, Fire and Rescue Services, central government, professional bodies, academia and consultancies. We would like to thank them all for their assistance though they will remain anonymous.

The research was designed to understand how the sector is perceived. Although desk-based analysis did make up an important part of the work carried out, the process was largely qualitative and relied on opinions and experiences of those working in and around the road safety sector.

It is stressed that the opinions and conclusions outlined in this report are those of PACTS and the author. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the RAC Foundation or the organisations consulted as part of the report.

## **Auditing the Sector – Key Resources**

Before looking at the structural weaknesses of the road safety sector and assessing the impact of the emergency budget on road safety, this section provides a snapshot of the way in which the road safety sector views resource. During interviews we asked practitioners to discuss the ‘tools of their trade’ and found a wide understanding of ‘resource’ in the road safety sector. Resources can be split into seven broad groups: Data; Evidence; Funding; Knowledge Sharing; Partnerships; People; and Strategy and Targets.

### **Data**

At a local level, the most regularly referred to data source by all delivery partners is that which comes from the police and which is then collated nationally as STATS19. In depth data analysis at the local level can be used to generate more evidence led and targeted approaches to road safety activity. One such analysis which has now become a national tool is Road Safety Analysis project, MAST.<sup>5</sup>

It is widely understood and increasingly documented that STATS19 data fail to capture the full range of injury collisions. The DfT have begun to provide an article in Reported Road Casualties Great Britain which brings together Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) and data from the National Travel Survey (NTS) in order to provide an estimate of the full range of injury collisions.<sup>6</sup>

### **Evidence and Knowledge Sharing**

Recent research conducted by Chris Lines Consulting (2010) on behalf of the DfT identified a confusing and often high-level network of safety information which often failed to be picked up by practitioners, particularly in areas where road safety is a low priority activity. We were provided with a long but non-exhaustive list of key players

for road safety knowledge sharing which has been added to by PACTS and can be found in Annex A of this report. The analysis identifies a need for a single portal with accessible and relevant research, evidence and data for road safety practitioners.

## Funding

Funding for road safety activity has, over the course of the last strategy, come from a range of sources and is both complex and subject to variation between local areas. In 2009, the DfT stated the following elements of departmental spending which contribute towards road safety activity<sup>7</sup>.

- Area-based Grant, specific Road Safety Capital Grant and funding for Transport for London and supporting Department for Transport agency work;
- The Integrated Transport Block of the local transport capital settlement;
- The Department for Transport's road safety demonstration project programme;
- The Block Revenue Support Grant for local authority services; and
- The Road Safety Partnership Grant.

Within these allocations, funding and spending are split into revenue and capital. Capital funding generally comes from the Integrated Transport allocation linked to Local Transport Plans. Revenue funding has come from Local Authority budgets. It has been the case that revenue budgets can be spent on capital but not capital budgets on revenue. Safety camera activities have been funded through hypothecation and latterly through the Road Safety Grant. The Road Safety Grant has funded a significant number of other road safety services and initiatives, including support for enforcement and community engagement.

Road safety allocations have generally been made on a needs/formula basis against the 1994 to 1998 baseline for *Tomorrow's Roads*, although recent amendments have been made to reflect current casualty levels.

These budgets have been supplemented through various other sources and initiatives including partnership support, for example the NHS funding teaching and awareness activities such as Smart Risk and part funding key appointments. Government initiatives have included the Neighbourhood Road Safety Initiative, the Road Safety Partnership Grant scheme and investment in the Beacon Council scheme, Timebank and its successor, the Road Safety Knowledge Bank. Funding for road safety activity also comes via the Police through various formats including the National Driver Offender Retraining Scheme (NDORS). Additional balances and Fire and Rescue funding comes locally from Council Tax.

## Partnerships

Many official and unofficial partnerships exist within the road safety community and experience varying degrees of success. The most well-known type of partnership is the semi-official joining of all local statutory bodies involved in road safety which are funded through the road safety component of the Area based Grant (the West Yorkshire Safer Roads partnership is one example)<sup>8</sup> Our interviews found particular

support for the partnership approach as it has helped forge effective relationships with the Police and to a lesser extent the Fire and Rescue Services.

Though models were not deemed perfect, they were considered useful foundations on which to build. In some areas, partnerships had carried out complete audits of their activities and had helped partners to ensure that interventions and efforts were as effective and complementary as possible. Critics of Safer Roads-type partnerships point out that they would be preferable if accountable to the public or to government.

Fifty-six additional Road Safety Partnership projects which brought together a wider range of stakeholders including academics and third sector organisations had been confirmed as funded by DfT during the period 2007-2011.<sup>9</sup> The Department for Transport's financial support for all 56 partnership projects has almost always been a proportion of the gross costs. The grant for these partnerships has been paid quarterly in arrears, with the split of the Department for Transport funding support available between the two financial years that projects last being determined at the outset.<sup>10</sup> When introduced, the partnership project grants were intended to promote the take-up and sharing of good practice in road safety delivery, encourage partnership-working among local authorities and others, preferably leveraging funding from other sources (both public and private), encourage innovative initiatives and ways of working to address road safety issues and to mainstream the most effective lessons from recent road safety pilot projects.<sup>11</sup> Evidence suggests that all four objectives are being achieved and an estimated first year rate of return of 190 per cent<sup>12</sup> is similar to that of sampled large safety engineering schemes.

Local and national government form another key partnership. Representatives of both levels from all aspects of road safety delivery felt this relationship needed to be improved to ensure that the roles being carried out are as effective as possible.

## **Strategy and Targets**

The UN report *Improving Global Road Safety: Setting Regional and National Road Traffic Casualty Reduction Targets*<sup>13</sup>, showed that by 2004, many countries had set national targets, and in addition regional targets had been set within the European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT) for its member countries. A review of the safety performance of 7 OECD countries<sup>14</sup> showed that having in place a quantified target is associated with an annual average reduction in road deaths over the whole target period that is 4 per cent per year greater than in previously similarly performing countries that set no target.

There are several reasons why having measurable outcomes for road safety deliver augmented benefit.<sup>15</sup>

- Measurable goals help to widen the range of delivery partners including the private sector and the public and increase accountability;
- Performance monitoring conveys the message that the government is serious about reducing road casualties;

- Sub-national goal-setting widens the sense of ownership by creating greater accountability, establishing more partnerships, and generating more action; and
- Performance monitoring raises media and public awareness and motivates politicians at all levels of government to support policy changes that improve road safety and provide an appropriate share of available resources.

The UN report endorses British practice that the strategy and goals should be empirically based taking account of the existing road safety situation and the policy framework necessary to deliver casualty reduction measures. The 2004 *World Report on Road Traffic Injury Prevention*<sup>16</sup> recommended that national road safety strategies should include ambitious but achievable performance targets, supported by national plans that set out specific interventions to achieve them. In *Safety on the Roads: What's the Vision?* the OECD makes the following recommendation: 'Target setting leads to more realistic and effective programmes, results in better integration of institutional efforts and, by securing political commitment, often produces a more focussed allocation of resources.'<sup>17</sup> If Britain did not have a road safety target beyond 2010, we would be unique among other high-performing nations.

At the local level in Great Britain, this research is confirmed, with road safety practitioners relying heavily on the existence of a strategy and some form of measurable performance outcome to ensure that they obtain sufficient funding for local road safety activity which is otherwise seen as a 'non vote winning' policy area.

## **Auditing the Sector – Structural Weaknesses**

On 1 March 2010, the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the current road safety strategy *Tomorrow's Roads, Safer for Everyone*, PACTS published *Taking Stock and Moving Forward*<sup>18</sup>, a review of the statistical performance of the road safety sector in Britain. On the whole, the review was positive about the progress which had been made over the last ten years.

However, despite significant reductions in collisions over the last decade which have resulted in the achievement of all targets set in the previous road safety strategy, there are a number of weaknesses which continue to burden the road safety sector. Such weaknesses exist broadly within two groups: statistical weaknesses, those road users who are statistically at higher risk of death and injury – which will not be discussed here, and structural weaknesses, structures and processes within the road safety sector which slow efficiency and which could be preventing premature death and injury on British roads.

This section identifies a number of these structural weaknesses which have been considered alongside current concerns around political and economic contexts in order to develop a number of recommendations to be considered when making decisions relating to the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR).

The road safety sector in Britain is, on the whole, well-coordinated and effective, yet a number of structural factors which have come about often as a result of the organic growth of the sector, result in inefficiencies which could be improved.

- Gaps between national and local governance: There has for some time been a complex relationship between national and local government which has slowed the sharing of knowledge and the delivery of some research and interventions.
- Slow and inaccessible publication of research by government: Interviews highlighted difficulties for practitioners using research commissioned by DfT, often finding the style too academic and time consuming to be useful. The publication of Local Transport Notes and, more recently, summary papers attached to longer research reports has been deemed a useful way-in for practitioners which could be further improved.
- Fragmented and wide-ranging number of agencies: There are many research organisations and a number of points of access for practitioners. Interviews highlighted difficulties including the obtaining of accessible research, awareness of knowledge sharing events and a lack of accreditation of research, intervention and training.
- Varying divisional boundaries: The agencies involved in partnerships often observe different physical boundaries which sometimes resulted in communication and organisational difficulties at the local level.
- Partnership organisation: A number of partnerships reported poor communication and organisation which led to repetition of interventions by different agencies of the partnership.
- Rigid geographical structure to partnerships: The focus on developing partnerships between neighbouring geographical areas, rather than encouraging joint working between areas with similar circumstances means that potential economies of scale benefits are being missed.
- Ring-fencing of budgets: using a grant-based approach to road safety has sometimes resulted in the application of interventions 'because funding was available'. This has been seen to distract from a more evidence-led approach to improving road safety in local areas.
- Low prioritisation of skills training: The road safety sector was thought to lack an effective and accredited training system. This was considered to be of particular concern when partner agencies such as the fire service were enthusiastic and willing to 'join-up' but could not be offered sufficient or sustained training.
- Evaluation: Research conducted by TRL shows three areas of road safety intervention which have a reliable effect on casualty rates. These include: measures to reduce levels of drink/driving, road safety engineering and improved standards of secondary safety in cars (DESS measures). The core programme of other measures (such as road safety education) and new measures (such as Electronic Stability Control (ESC)) is less easy to evaluate,<sup>19</sup> making it difficult for practitioners to make decisions about choice of intervention. Additionally, interviews have shown a lack of commitment to evaluation at the Director level of Local government which has removed motivation and incentive to evaluate interventions.

## Creating a Vacuum – What’s the Context?

As 2010 reaches its end, a new road safety environment is emerging. Three key areas of impact are the:

- End of the current road safety strategy;
- Change in political administration and associated policy prioritisation; and
- Continuing recession and austerity measures outlined in the emergency 2010/2011 budget and planned changes for 2011/2012 onwards.

These three factors combine to create the context within which road safety will now exist. It is important to assess their individual and combined impact and to identify a viable and acceptable approach to delivering road safety beyond 2010.

### ***Tomorrow’s Roads Draws to a Close***

A road casualty reduction target for GB was set for the first time in 1987 for a one-third reduction by 2000. It was very successful in increasing the priority to be given to road safety and generating activity to reduce deaths and injuries. By 2000 deaths and serious injuries had fallen by 48 per cent compared with the baseline<sup>20</sup>. Following public consultation a new strategy and target were proposed for 2010 to build on this success. 1st March 2010 saw the tenth anniversary of the road safety strategy *Tomorrow’s Roads, Safer for Everyone*.

Recent PACTS research has found widespread support for the role which the *Tomorrow’s Roads* strategy has played over the last ten years. The strategy provided the headline casualty reduction targets for 2010 of 40 per cent reduction in overall numbers of KSI, 50 per cent reduction in child KSI and 10 per cent reduction in the slight casualty rate and encouraged specific efforts on ten key themes. *Tomorrow’s Roads* was developed in active consultation with many road safety stakeholders, and was comprehensible, feasible and relevant. Delivery partners found that it helped to generate support for road safety within the wider context of their respective areas of work. A positive outcome from the focus on achieving measurable goals over the last decade has been the building of local partnerships involving a wide range of organisations which promote road safety and work together to implement locally relevant and cost-effective measures.<sup>21</sup>

As the strategy reaches its end, local road safety delivery teams have already begun to face difficulties. The third round of Local Transport Plans is due to be in place by April 2011<sup>22</sup> but they lack guidance on the inclusion of safety measures due to the lack of a current relevant strategy. This strategy void is added to by the absence of any safety guideline for ‘integration’ in Annex A of Guidance on Local Transport Plans.<sup>23</sup> Interviews we held with local delivery partners identified the following problems with the absence of a road safety strategy for the future:

- Difficulty or impossibility of securing funding;
- Difficulty gaining interest of prioritisation for road safety;
- Re-allocation of resources (including staff) to other policy areas;
- Difficulty maintaining partnerships; and

- Perceived failure in the relationship between national and local government.


Research conducted by Capita Symonds on behalf of the DfT in 2004 backs up the issues identified here, stating that 'in general, those Local Highway Authorities whose strategic aims make clear reference to road safety are better performers'.<sup>24</sup>

### The Coalition Government

An initial Coalition Agreement<sup>25</sup> was superseded by the more extensive Programme for government<sup>26</sup> which sets out government priorities by policy area. A number of key themes run through the Programme, which is centred on a headline necessity to reduce the deficit, including 'Localism', 'Transparency' and 'Fairness'. In addition, although transport has not been a central policy focus for the coalition, there has been a fairly high profile decision to '*end the war on the motorist*'.<sup>27</sup>

**Cutting the deficit:** The new government has placed budget deficit reduction at the top of its priority list, highlighting that in 2009 the Public Sector Net Borrowing forecast was the largest in Britain's peacetime history (shown in Chart 1 below).

**Chart 1 UK Net Borrowing by Year Since 1993**



Over the course of this parliament, the government is committed to accelerating the reduction of the deficit largely through reductions in spending rather than increased taxation.<sup>28</sup> The new government acted quickly to introduce an emergency budget and a budget plan for the next five years<sup>29</sup> and the Treasury began to consult on a spending review which will outline public spending plans for the next four years.<sup>30</sup> This is due to be published on 20 October 2010.

**Localism:** Central to coalition plans is the desire to shrink the role and power of the central state and focus on the decentralization of politics. Greg Clark, Minister for Decentralization, has outlined the following need as government moves forward.

“We need to turn central government upside down and inside-out. Instead of the civil service only being focused upwards on providing advice to Ministers - and inwards on its own priorities - we must drive the focus downwards and outwards to put those resources at the service of communities nationwide.”

Also known as the Big Society policy, the decentralization approach launched by David Cameron on 19 July, aims to “give the power back to the people”.<sup>31</sup>

Although the objectives, key players and projected outputs of the Big Society have been well documented,<sup>32</sup> a significant level of confusion exists around the process itself. It is expected that government will look more closely at this in the Decentralization and Localism Bill<sup>33,34</sup> announced in the Queen’s Speech on 25 May 2010 and expected in November 2010, and in other policy documents such as the current Draft Structural Reform plan.<sup>35</sup>

Decentralization will have an important effect on the way in which local government activity is carried out. This will be particularly marked by a commitment to minimise the level of ring-fencing applied to local government funding and spending decisions and processes.

**Ending the ‘War on the Motorist’:** Further to commitments made by Theresa Villiers during her time as shadow Transport Secretary, Philip Hammond, Secretary of State for Transport, has regularly pledged that government aims to end ‘Labour’s War’ on the motorist. This approach has seen pledges to prevent further road pricing, stabilise the price of fuel, prevent rogue wheel clamping and stop all funding for new fixed speed cameras. This final policy which on the surface appears to be at odds with the overarching coalition commitment to decentralization of spending decisions, has been widely commented on in the media, initially fairly supportively<sup>36</sup> and latterly from a negative angle as a result of potential impact on the safety of communities<sup>37</sup>.

In reality, the decisions about speed cameras will be taken locally, but it has been widely perceived by the road safety community and to an extent by the general public, that national government is not committed to road safety activity. This perception has been compounded by the way in which the emergency budget has been carried out across the transport sector and by the lack of road safety strategy for beyond 2010. The Secretary of State further complicated this conflict when giving oral evidence to the Transport Select Committee on 26 July 2010:

**Q83 Lilian Greenwood:** “I wanted to turn to the issue of road safety. There is a lot of emphasis in the government on localism, but nationally you have made it very clear you will not support funding additional safety or speed cameras, and also there has been a reduction in funding for local authorities’ road safety provisions. I wondered whether the government is intending to publish a new national road safety strategy and, if you are, how is it likely to be different? If you are not, how do you envisage road safety being ensured?”

**Mr. Hammond:** “I am glad you have asked me that question because it does allow me to set the record straight on the road safety funding for local government. The Coalition has made it clear that there will be no more specific funding for speed cameras, however highway authorities will be able to fund speed cameras if that is

their view of the way in which they wish to prioritise their road safety funding. There is a misunderstanding about the road safety grant to local authorities. The Department for Transport's support for local authorities for the current year was reduced as part of the in-year spending reductions by £309 million. Delivery of the reductions to local authority grant funding was entirely in the form of ring-fenced and special grants, specific and special grants, simply because there was no mechanism in-year for reducing the formula grant which makes up the bulk of local authority funding. At the same time, the Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government announced the de-ring-fencing of a significant tranche of local government funding and made clear that the expectation is that local authorities would use this new freedom to drive efficiencies out of their spending across the whole range of local government activity in order to re-prioritise to their own priorities. It is not and was not the intention of the government to send any signal that it expects local authorities to reduce their spending on road safety by any greater percentage than their spending across the board as a whole. The road safety grant was simply one of the specific grants which was the mechanism for delivering that change. So I hope that is well understood by local authorities and that they will continue to invest in road safety initiatives but using their own set of priorities based on their local conditions."<sup>38</sup>

## **The Emergency Budget**

On 24 May 2010, the Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne and the former Chief Secretary to the Treasury, David Laws announced an emergency budget including £6.2 billion of savings to take place in 2010-11, overriding previous spending decisions made for this period:

Outside of local government and the devolved administrations, the savings are allocated across different areas as follows:

- £1.15 billion in discretionary areas like consultancy and travel costs
- £95m through savings in IT spending
- £1.7 billion from delaying and stopping contracts and projects, including immediate negotiation to achieve cost reductions from the major suppliers to government
- £170 million from reductions in property costs
- At least £120 million from a recruitment freeze across the civil service for the rest of 2010-11
- £600 million from cutting the cost of quangos
- £520 million by reducing other lower value spend.

The impact of these decisions at the national level has seen the prevention of a number of initiatives including some road safety research projects. Additionally, all publicity and marketing campaigns have to be approved both by the department concerned and by the Cabinet Office. This has already resulted in less activity although it is as yet unclear which campaigns will be maintained. As part of the overall spending cuts, £1.165 billion of savings were planned for local government. The Chancellor also pledged to remove ring-fencing around over £1.7 billion of

grants to local authorities in 2010-11 to give them “greater flexibility to re-shape their budgets and find savings in the areas set out above.”<sup>39</sup>

In 2009, under previous administration and prior to the emergency budget, the DfT had stated the following structure for local road safety funding<sup>40</sup>:

- £110 million per year, confirmed up to and including 2010/11, for road safety in the Area-based Grant, specific Road Safety Capital Grant and funding for Transport for London and supporting Department for Transport agency work;
- The Integrated Transport Block of the local transport capital settlement – about £120 million per year of this is spent on road safety;
- The Department for Transport's road safety demonstration project programme – in 2009/10 about £5 million is allocated for work by four rural authorities;
- The Block Revenue Support Grant for local authority services; and
- The Road Safety Partnership Grant represents £11 million for 2007 to early 2011.

The emergency budget asked DfT to make cuts of £683 million, including a £309 million reduction from the following DfT grants:

**Table 1 DfT Allocation of Emergency Budget Cuts**

Integrated Transport Block	-150.8
Major Projects	-61.4
Yorkshire and Humber ITB transfer	-23.5
Capital detrunking	-6.8
PRN networking funding	-5.9
Urban congestion fund	-7.9
Smaller grants, of which:	-15.0
Kickstart 2009	-5.0
Other funding support, as yet unallocated	-10.0
Road Safety capital grant	-17.2
Road Safety revenue grant	-20.6

The final two cuts in the above table represent a 27 per cent cut to the revenue grant (with £20.6 million being taken off a previously allocated £76.7 million) and a 100 per cent cut to the capital grant (£17.2 million).

When making decisions around cuts to local government transport, it was vital that spending opportunities remained fair and equal across all authorities and that funding was as flexible as possible. As such, savings were made in those places which were either less flexible or less evenly spread across the country and more flexible budgets were maintained in order to allow for actual local allocation of spending to be decided locally. For example, the decision to cut the road safety capital grant by 100 per cent and the revenue grant by 27 per cent was based on the structure of funding which allows revenue to be used for capital but which does not allow capital funding to be used for revenue. It had also been presumed that the structure of budget cuts at the national level would not be replicated at the local

level, and that spending on road safety would continue. This in hindsight was a misguided presumption.

The way in which central government had hoped the cuts would be absorbed, in reality did not occur. The combination of ending ‘the war against the motorist’ and cutting 100 per cent of the capital funding has been widely perceived among the road safety community and the media as an indication that national government do not prioritize road safety as a transport policy area. This was added to with public announcements from Ministers stating that they would ‘no longer fund new fixed speed cameras’. The national statement from government that local communities should have more freedom about spending decisions conflicts directly with DfT statements that they no longer fund fixed speed cameras and has resulted in not only mixed messages but also significant levels of confusion.

Today’s situation sees a combination of three key factors which have made an important impact on perceptions of road safety. The end of the current strategy has occurred at the same time as a change in administration and the emergency establishment of significant budgetary savings have created something of a policy vacuum which is currently being filled with perceptions, assumption and actions which must be better understood to ensure that decisions made during and following the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) are as effective as possible.<sup>41,42,43</sup>

## **Perceptions are Real – The Impact of the Emergency Budget**

Whilst researching this report, PACTS spoke to over 70 professionals working in or close to the road safety sector. This research has fed into this section of the report which looks at how the emergency cuts in transport spending on road safety have been perceived and also into section eight which highlights the key areas where spending should continue post CSR if we are to ensure that the road safety community is able to be more effective at carrying out fewer interventions with less money.

### **Road Safety, a Priority?**

Based on the way in which transport spending cuts have occurred at the national level, it has been widely perceived that government does not prioritize road safety activity, despite public announcements suggesting that cuts were not expected to be replicated at the local level. The lack of political will has already been echoed at the local level among elected members desperate to make spending decisions as soon as possible.

With the current lack of road safety strategy, road safety delivery at the local level is already beginning to experience difficulties. A number of authorities noted severe reductions in staffing and in some cases the entire removal of all road safety posts. Additionally, road safety activity had been severely slowed or stopped. Of the 37 partnerships we consulted in England and Wales, two had already closed down, seventeen had already seen cuts passed on from the local authority of at least as much as the national cut, four had seen no cuts and the 14 others were awaiting decision making.

Concern was also expressed around a lack of skills in the sector which, although already a well known condition, would be added to by the removal of significant proportions of road safety teams disproportionately affecting the more experienced employees.

There was a high level of concern over the development of the next round of Local Transport Plans (LTP) and the lack of influence which safety policy would have on the overall structure. Worry was expressed around the cost of not carrying out road safety activity in terms of both immediate loss of life and also in terms of the impact in several years on both a lack of investment in engineering and a lack of sufficient road safety education for young road users soon to gain independence and experience risk.

Mistrust in central government was observed and it was seen that the early throws of decentralization had left local government at a loss, isolated and unsure about which decision they were able and/or correct to take. Additionally, uncertainty surrounded the 'big society' involvement of communities in policy activity. It was felt that local government was severely lacking in strategic guidance and direction in terms of the role they play and the opportunities they had. A lack of coherent communication between local and national government was clear, which played an important role in laying the foundations for effective decision making.

On the other hand, it was evident that a certain level of optimism was maintained. With 'everything to play for' it was certainly the case that local delivery partners felt motivated and able to start again in areas which were less effective and work to improve evaluation methods to ensure the viability of a more evidence-focused approach to road safety. New opportunities had led to discussion around the possibility for a more preventative focus across the health spectrum including road safety, although those with most lengthy experience in the sector showed a level of skepticism about involving a wider range of delivery partners during a time of economic constraint.

One layer of complaint lay in the feeling that some long-serving practitioners had 'seen it all before' and were tired of 'meaningless rebranding'. This was underlined by a feeling that local delivery partners had to fight for road safety to be a priority for local and national government rather than being able to get on with their jobs.

Despite some optimism, local delivery partners were worried for their jobs and for their sector, feeling less able to control outcomes in both areas.

## **Research Gap**

Although it has not been possible to assess the full range of research which has had to be halted, there are three main areas of concern for the road safety community surrounding a decline in the level of research being carried out.

**In-depth accident studies:** A number of DfT-funded research projects in the pre-funding stages were stopped as a result of cuts outlined in the emergency budget. Although understanding that cuts are a priority, experts expressed concern in three strands when discussing research. A particular area for discussion was the absence

of the In Depth Accident Study. A number of those interviewed expressed worry about losing continuity of data and concern over the abolition of relationships formed among post-crash research and investigation agencies.

**Research as an exportable commodity:** Britain has had a strong level of data collection and analysis in road safety which is now threatened. In the past, in-depth studies have assisted the development of vehicle design through Euro NCAP<sup>44</sup> and helped to shape policy direction to ensure that the conditions behind vulnerability and risk on the roads are better understood and better treated. Without the data collection focus and research credibility which provides the British road safety sector with an important level of expertise and an enviable reputation, British road safety expertise will become a less valuable export. Among the private and public sectors, it was felt that not only would the integrity of research be an issue, but we may also witness a 'brain drain' and after some years a lack of credible knowledge exports.

**Spending where it counts:** In times of financial austerity, it is vital that available resources are allocated in the most effective way. If we continue to see a decline in the prioritization of road safety research, it will become harder to make spending decisions about interventions within and beyond the broad categories of engineering, education and enforcement.

## **The Great Speed Camera Debate**

The conflict highlighted earlier between localism and provision of funding for new fixed speed cameras has led to a great deal of public and media unrest on the topic. Following a particularly well-publicized 'switch-off' in Oxfordshire on 1 August 2010, the Thames Valley Safer Roads Partnership monitored data at four camera locations over 32 days. Though limited, the results indicate that motorists do alter their speed choices when they are aware that a camera is not loaded with film.<sup>45</sup>

Recent concern around the impact of public statements on speed cameras has been expressed to the Ministerial team in the form of an open letter from Mick Giannasi Roads Policing Lead at the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO). He outlined the potential impact which the implied removal of funding for camera partnerships could have on road safety activities:

- Significant loss of revenue to the Treasury;
- Inability to divert offenders into education programmes;
- Failure of managed motorways to smooth traffic flow;
- Reversal of the excellent progress in casualty reduction in recent years;
- Deterioration in driver behaviour and compliance; and
- Ending partnership funded child road safety education.

Safety cameras have played an important role in a systematic approach to reducing road death and injury on our roads. Evidence suggests that camera sites have seen important collision and casualty reductions, though further national research has not been conducted since the four year evaluation by DfT published in 2005.<sup>46</sup> A recent international study conducted for the Cochrane Library shows that speed cameras are effective at reducing speeds and collisions and that speed cameras are a

worthwhile intervention for reducing the number of road traffic injuries and deaths.<sup>47</sup> There is no reason to suggest that safety cameras should be the only means for behavioural change. The more important observation is that safety cameras play an important role as part of a range of tools within a systems approach to road safety. Concern is not that cameras vanish from our streets, but rather that these important safety tools will fall into disrepute and will cease to be used despite their effectiveness as safety tools.

## **Comprehensive Spending Review – More With Less; But How?**

Based on the interviews conducted for this report, PACTS makes recommendations for the road safety sector below. It should be noted that these recommendations are intended to influence decision making during the translation of the Comprehensive Spending Review to specific policy outcomes later in the year. We have formed our recommendations by analysing the road safety sector prior to and since the emergency budget cuts have been put in place. Minimising the potential negative impacts of further spending cuts will be extremely important if we are to ensure that the road safety sector remains effective in the medium and long terms and that the level of death and injury does not increase or, as a result, add a significant cost to the public purse.

Recommendations fall into five broad categories: Working with Coalition Values – Whose Job is it Anyway; Strategy; Community Engagement; Partnerships; and Research Priorities.

### **Working with Coalition Values - Whose Job is it Anyway?**

This report has identified a policy gap which has emerged in road safety as a result of three simultaneous but not entirely related factors. It is very likely that the conceptualization and delivery of road safety will be altered as a result. The tightening of spending across the public sector has coincided with a change in political administration involving a focus on decentralization and the end of the current road safety strategy. The road safety sector will need to be more effective with fewer resources at the same time as observing a new range of roles and a shift in direction from national to local government.

One of the important concerns identified during the course of this research has been the sense that the bridge between national and local government has increasingly become a void. At the local level practitioners are concerned not only that they are undirected but also under-provided with the tools required in order to direct themselves. Furthermore, a large amount of ring-fencing has been removed from significantly reduced local spending budgets. This has meant that local road safety teams have struggled to secure funding for their activities and for their staff.

The previous government had already been heading towards having a less centralised policy direction and would also have had to make spending cuts. The change in administration has simply speeded-up this process. It will require equally rapid reactions at all levels of society and government in order to absorb new processes and to ensure efficiency and fairness.

**The role of national government:** Although across some policy areas, ‘facilitator’ has become something of a token term, its application in today’s context is vital. The message from national government is that policy should be a local issue, it is therefore essential that local government and society are armed with the right tools to ensure that they are able to carry out their refreshed roles. The economies of scale which can be maximized at the national level should be used wherever possible without distracting from a focus on local relevance. The recently published *Efficiency Review*<sup>48</sup> has identified a cross-Whitehall failure to benefit from the buying power of a large organization – a more coherent approach here would make an important impact on cost savings.

As such, it is envisaged that national government should be responsible for the delivery or commissioning of the following key areas of road safety:

- Provision of a ‘live’ road safety strategy and framework for local benchmarking;
- A coordinated research effort based on areas of greatest need. There are many bodies, in the public, private and third sector industries that are undertaking research into road safety. Harnessing this collective work could be very powerful indeed;
- Provision of a single evidence portal which is accessible and written for the benefit of all stakeholders including politicians, the public, the press and practitioners;
- Provision of the tools with which performance benchmarking is possible and accessible to all, plus an additional annual report which looks statistically at progress using a benchmarking approach (and which may be based on a wider version of the current *Reported Road Casualties* format);
- Targeted assistance to ensure that risk inequalities across the social-demographic spectrum are minimized;
- Provision of the networks with which to share good practice across area types rather than simply among local and regional partners;
- Provision of a tool which can be used by local communities from which they can identify their own vision for future levels of road safety including the timescales they would like to see. Publicity for the tool should be funded nationally and based on a national model though locally relevant information should be applied. Such a tool would provide the public and key decision makers with the ability to set out their objectives for their local area using information provided which would link their expectations with the kinds of activity and interventions required. By linking the two, it is expected that locally-determined performance aims would be more realistic and encourage wider ‘buy-in’ to road safety activity. (A tool of this kind could be more widely used to allow local communities to project their aspirations across a range of locally influenced quality of life issues such as air quality and access requirements.)
- Provision of guidance for local government on securing funding, using a more evidence-focused approach, good practice information on partnership working and engaging with communities;
- Participation in European and global research initiatives;

- Continued information and support for employers interested in contributing towards safer roads through driving for work strategies; and
- A fast moving programme to highlight Ministerial commitment to road safety and to counter the perceptions of a lack of interest in the area.

**The role of local government:** Local government is expected to become increasingly important and will be expected to play the role of analyst, strategic planner and delivery agent. As such, local government will need to have suitable influence on and thus 'buy-into' the backbone provided at the national level. The current situation should be viewed as an opportunity to improve road safety performance whilst working more closely with the community and the private sector. Local government should be responsible for:

- Taking an evidence-focused approach including the analysis of greatest need and the evaluation of road safety activity;
- Committing to the strategy model, which includes updating any central repository with data, experiences and evaluations of interventions, as well as working with public opinion ;
- Working more closely with other policy areas at the local level;
- Participating in partnership working locally, regionally and with areas of similar conditions; and
- Ensuring that road safety activity is co-ordinated across the full local area to ensure maximum output.

**The role of communities:** The Big Society model involves a much higher level of participation in policy by the general public. Our interviews identified wide-ranging difficulty with engaging communities. It is vital that national government provides assistance in this area by sharing good practice and identifying 'ways in' for road safety.

The public should be encouraged to engage with the following key areas of road safety:

- Generation of a local vision for road safety based on a model developed in partnership by national government and local government. The local road safety objectives could be integrated into a wider 'localism tool' or portal which allows local communities to feed in their aspirations around a range of quality of life issues;
- Assuming responsibilities attached with the right to use the highway;
- Understanding the gap between perception and reality in road safety and identifying with evidence-led practice.

**The role of employers:** In 2009, the then shadow Health Secretary, Andrew Lansley, published *The Responsibility Deal 2*.<sup>49</sup> The document formed part of a series introduced by David Cameron which was designed to provide a unique way in which the government and business can work together to achieve positive societal changes. The series picked up on themes which are particularly important in today's context and should be used as a model with which to encourage more effective

working on road safety issues between businesses and government at the local level.

Employers should be responsible for the following key areas of road safety:

- Participation in the generation of a local vision for road safety;
- Assuming responsibilities attached with the right to use the highway;
- Contributing towards their vision for safety in the local area;
- Development and application of driving for work strategies and policies including commuter safety; and
- Assisting road safety activity at the local level through provision of resource and/or funding.

## Strategy

Based on our analysis of the road safety sector as it is today and as it may be in the near future, it is vital that a strategic backbone is provided by national government for all stakeholders. In order to ensure that such a strategy 'fits' with current political and economical contexts, the onus should be on providing the tools with which to ensure efficient and effective research, knowledge, networks and guidance to all involved.

In a sense, the strategy should bring together strategic advice and frameworks with the amalgamation of the currently fragmented nature of road safety evidence, research information and guidance into a one-stop road safety shop.

As such, it is envisaged that the strategy should be a live web-based document which will grow organically over its course when populated with increasing levels of data, knowledge, good practice and discussion and which will have a variety of interfaces with the varying types of interested party, similar, in that sense, to the 10:10 model.<sup>50</sup> 10:10 is a grassroots movement which brings together people, schools, businesses, and organizations who pledge to cut their carbon emissions by 10 per cent over the course of a year. Various different user types (people, businesses, education and organization) are offered information which is tailored to their own activities, more relevant to their particular priorities and therefore a more useful tool with which they can work towards their 10 per cent reduction.

The strategy should not be a directive tool but rather a source of information for those now responsible for the direction and delivery of road safety. Tools within the strategy should include:

- Data analysis tools with which all stakeholders can observe local performance. Local government should also be able to use the tool to identify key areas of focus and feed data back into the system;
- A research portal bringing together the many research providers which also provides a constantly updated synthesis of research by issue type, user type, condition type and intervention type so that practitioners will not have to wade through several research reports in order to reach conclusions;

- A network allowing for knowledge and good practice sharing between practitioners;
- Evaluation tools such as the developing E-valu-it tool<sup>51</sup>;
- Access to information about skills training and events; and
- An accreditation scheme applied across all tools in the strategy with which users can rate good practice sharing, training, research reports and so on. Based on the most relevant model available. (We suggest looking at those models used in retail<sup>52</sup> and hospitality<sup>53</sup> which the general public are already accustomed to using).

Essentially, the live strategy model should ensure that all interested parties can access information about their area, compare it with information about other areas, find out about road risks and interventions, understand the impact of the individual and of the employer, generate local performance targets, assist the local authority identifying areas of concern, hold stakeholders to account, generate local buy-in, provide the data with which national government can conduct wider analysis, make road safety more transparent and more likely to be linked to evidence, guarantee that training and research is subject to public scrutiny, and bring together the academic and practitioner alongside local communities, lobby groups and national government. The live strategy should also seek to close the developing void between national and local government.

## Community Engagement

During committee stages of passing through Commons, The Conservative Party, when in opposition, made an attempt to introduce a new clause to the *Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Bill 2008-09* which would have introduced a stronger role for local communities and local government in terms of their ability to act in the interest of the well being of the local community.

The general power of competence for local authorities is a new power intended to give such authorities the ability to act in the best interests of their communities, even if specific legislation does not give those authorities the power to take the action they intend. Thus, no action – except for raising taxes – will be beyond the power of local government, unless that action is prevented by law. The power will be included in the *Decentralisation and Localism Bill* due to be introduced in the autumn of 2010, and will take its place alongside other proposals planned to be in the bill such as the replacement of Regional Development Agencies with Local Enterprise Partnerships and the abolition of Regional Spatial Strategies. The Bill is intended to complete its passage through parliament by November 2011.<sup>54</sup>

Part of the implementation of the Bill will include some kind of interface with which local communities can influence policy and activity in their area. It therefore seems appropriate that a road safety strategy of this kind should be linked with community aspirations about the safety of their road users. We suggest:

- A local democracy web tool which allows the local public and politicians to express their aspirations for their own communities may be a vital component of making localism work. Using a model similar to those used by My Society<sup>55</sup>


and Unlock Democracy<sup>56</sup>, local communities could indicate their priorities for spending and be provided with enough information about a number of ‘well-being’ policy areas such as road safety from which they would be able to make suggestions about how local performance should be measured and what they should aim for. In road safety, it is well documented that vision zero is attractive to a local audience<sup>57</sup>; research published by the RAC found that 56 percent of the 2029 people asked in 2007 support a goal of zero fatalities although this is tempered by scepticism about how realistic such a policy might be.<sup>58</sup> So it will be necessary to ask the community to think about timescales in order to generate an effective aspiration. Such a tool will need to be backed up by a nationwide advertising campaign to generate public interest.

- All stakeholders should then be able to access information about how they can make their own activity safer, as seen in the 10:10 model for reducing carbon emissions.<sup>59</sup> This vision can lead to local targets which all stakeholders can then be held to account for.

## Evidence-Focused Working

The face of road safety has changed significantly since Conservative Roads Minister Peter Bottomley first announced targets for reducing road casualties in 1987.

**Chart 2 Road Deaths against Level of Vehicle Licensing, by Year<sup>60</sup>**



Casualty numbers have reduced dramatically and it is becoming harder to see the ‘easy wins’. Additionally, restricted budgets have impacted on the amount of work that can actually be done. As such, it is absolutely vital that evidence gathering and application are central to all interventions. The continued development of the DfT and ROSPA E-valu-it toolkit combined with a commitment by stakeholders to update and share information using the strategy networking tools and the ability to ‘rate’ effectiveness of research, training and intervention will result in a rapid transition to an evidence focus.

The wealth of experience which practitioners have is invaluable and is an important bridge between formal evidence and application of interventions. Delivery partners should ensure an educated balancing of approach.

## Partnerships


A range of partnerships have proved essential parts of road safety delivery over the last ten years. It is absolutely vital, as we focus on efficiency savings, that the local nature of partnership working on road safety is maintained. Partnerships should work together to ensure best use of resources and to generate a strategy of work which makes the most of each partner's strongest assets. However, an outcome of the organic and semi-official nature in which partnerships have developed is an inefficient and fragmented back-office system. It seems appropriate to separate the delivery side of partnership working, which is very much a local function from the administrative procedures, which could be carried out at a national level.

## Research Priorities

As we begin to see a reduction in research funding at the national level, it is increasingly important that resource is targeted to where we need it most. As such, PACTS sees the following four areas as central to the road safety research function of DfT beyond 2010.

**Synthesis of research:** In order to ensure that local delivery partners and stakeholders are armed with concise and accurate research, government should provide or commission a range of synthesis reports which highlight central conclusions, related key arguments and signpost further information. These reports should also point to good practice and provide links to areas of similar query and/or condition. These reports should be continually updated as new research becomes available and should be subject to the already noted accreditation scheme. Resource needs to be devoted to these actions.

**In-depth accident studies:** As casualty numbers come down, it is harder to see the holes in the system which can be attributed to weaknesses and thus to continuing casualty rates. Although the STATS 19 data does provide a significant amount of information about general trends, it is important that we have a further level of analysis which can contribute to better understanding around the latent conditions and behaviours which generate such trends. These include an evolving car fleet with many new technologies coming to market, including alternative power trains and a changing population, perhaps most importantly with regards to an aging society



We propose a targeted approach towards data collection strategies which will offer the best value, both in terms of costs per investigation and usefulness and practicality of the data collected. There is a genuine opportunity to re-design how in-depth accident investigation studies are completed and to integrate these with the national casualty data to ensure representative results are achieved. The alternative could be to simply downsize historic activities to match an available budget, which carries a large risk of producing a dataset which would not be fit for purpose.

**Policy scanning:** As the policy environment becomes increasingly cluttered and local government is required to consider a wide range of objectives, it is important that road safety is compatible and is improved wherever possible. As such, government should be constantly aware of changing policy priorities and provide information to delivery partners on how best to incorporate safety.

**International participation:** In order to maintain Britain's role as one of the world's leaders in road safety, it is important that a continued commitment to the field is observed at an international level. Participation not only ensures that Britain is aware of and can influence research developments, but also that our knowledge export capacity is maintained. The UK's national and in depth accident data should be harmonised with the wider European and International datasets to ensure meaningful comparisons can be made and best practice identified with respect to reducing road casualties."

## **Conclusion**

For over 20 years, Great Britain has had a co-ordinated approach to reducing deaths and injury on the roads. This approach has involved central and local government, statutory bodies such as the police and emergency services, professional organisations, academic institutions and civil society. Casualty reduction has been 'the Big Society' in all but name.

Road safety is an area where localism has supported and extended the aspirations of central government. Targets for reducing crashes are a success story. Letting up now would leave our citizens at greater risk of death and injury, especially those in deprived areas where road injury is more likely to occur.

The government understandably wishes to use the Comprehensive Spending Review as a means to reduce the budgetary deficit. Reductions in the deficit, however, must not be at the expense of the safety of the community.

## Annex A: Key Road Safety Evidence Resources

Listed below is the range of key safety evidence and information providers that we could come up with. There are likely to be a considerable number which we have failed to include in which case please do contact us. The chief purpose of this list is to highlight the fragmented nature of the road safety sector's access to information.

We have not included Universities except Loughborough. This is because there are too many and the access to research from them is variable. It should however be noted that

### Road Safety Data – Great Britain

- APHO health profiles: Open access <http://www.apho.org.uk/default.aspx?RID=49802>
- BRAKE: Open Access <http://www.brake.org.uk/facts>
- Department for Transport – Reported Road Casualties: Open access <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/statistics/datatablespublications/accidents/casualtiesgbar/>
- Department for Transport – Road Casualties Online: Open access <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/statistics/datatablespublications/accidents/roadcasualtiesonline/>
- London Road Safety Unit: Open Access <http://londonroadsafety.tfl.gov.uk/>
- MAST Online: Access to members <http://www.roadsafetyanalysis.org/mast-online/>
- Office for National Statistics: Open access <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/CCI/nscl.asp?ID=8094>
- Road Safety Foundation : Open Access <http://www.roadsafetyfoundation.com/>
- Road Safety Wales: Open access <http://www.roadsafetywales.org.uk/statistics/index.htm>
- Road Safety Scotland: Open access <http://www.road-safety.org.uk/> ]
- UK MoRSE (Monitoring data base – Road Safety engineering): Access to Members <http://www.uk-morse.com/>

### Road Safety News – Great Britain

- AA – Public Affairs: Open Access [http://www.theaa.com/public\\_affairs/road\\_safety.html](http://www.theaa.com/public_affairs/road_safety.html)
- AIRSO: Open Access <http://www.airso.co.uk/>
- IRSO: Open Access [www.irso.org.uk](http://www.irso.org.uk)
- Local Transport Today: Access to Members <http://www.transportxtra.com/>
- Road Safety GB: <http://www.roadsafetygb.org.uk/>
- Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety – news Section : Open Access <http://pacts.org.uk/news.php>
- RoSPA – News Section : Open Access <http://www.rospa.com/news/releases/default.aspx>

## Road Safety Research – Great Britain

- ADEPT : Open Access <http://www.cssnet.org.uk/>
- The Audit Commission – road safety: Open Access <http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/Pages/SearchResult.aspx?k=road%20safety&c=ALL&ps=any&dt=ANY&ord=rank&res=10&p=0>
- CIHT: Open Access <http://www.ciht.org.uk/>
- The Cochrane library: Open Access <http://www.thecochranelibrary.com/view/0/index.html>
- Department for Transport – research : Open Access <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgf/roadsafety/research/>
- Driving for Better Business: Open Access <http://www.drivingforbetterbusiness.com/>
- The Highways Agency: open Access <http://www.highways.gov.uk/knowledge/336.aspx>.
- IHIE: Open Access <http://www.ihie.org.uk/>
- Injury prevention: Access to Members <http://injuryprevention.bmj.com/>
- Loughborough Transport Safety Research Centre <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/lds/research/groups/tsrc/publications.html>
- NICE: Open Access <http://www.nice.org.uk/>
- NRSI: Open Access <http://www.nrsi.org.uk/nrsi/>
- London Road Safety Unit: Open Access <http://londonroadsafety.tfl.gov.uk/>
- Parliamentary Advisory Council for Transport Safety – research section : Open Access <http://pacts.org.uk/research.php>
- RAC Foundation – research: Open Access <http://www.racfoundation.org/research/safety>
- Road Peace: Open Access <http://www.roadpeace.org/>
- Road Safety Foundation : Open Access <http://www.roadsafetyfoundation.com/>
- Road Safety Knowledge Centre: Open Access <http://www.roadsafetyknowledgecentre.org.uk/>
- Road Safety Wales: Open Access <http://www.roadsafetywales.org.uk/education/primary/index.htm>
- RoSPA – Road Safety Section : Open Access <http://www.rospace.com/roadsafety/>
- the Scottish government: Open Access <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/Recent>
- South West Public Health Observatory: Open Access <http://www.swpho.nhs.uk/>
- Transport Advice Portal: Open Access <http://www.tap.ihf.org/en/topic/safety/index.cfm>
- TRL – research : Some Open Access some Access to Members [http://www.trl.co.uk/library/reports\\_publications/](http://www.trl.co.uk/library/reports_publications/)
- Transport Research Knowledge Centre: Open Access <http://www.transport-research.info/web/>
- Transport Select Committee: Open Access <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/transport-committee/publications/>

- UK Transport Research Centre: Open Access <http://www.uktrc.ac.uk/>

#### Special Interest

- Age UK : Open Access <http://www.ageuk.org.uk/>
- CTC : Open Access <http://www.ctc.org.uk/>
- Guide Dogs for the Blind: Open Access <http://www.guidedogs.org.uk/index.php?id=62>
- Living Streets: <http://www.livingstreets.org.uk/>

#### Road Safety Training

- TMS: Open Access TMS <http://www.tmsconsultancy.co.uk/>
- RoSPA: Open Access <http://www.rospace.com/>

#### International Information sites

- ARRB, <http://www.arrb.com.au/Safe-Systems.aspx>
- ERSO: Open Access <http://www.erso.eu>
- Europa, [http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road\\_safety/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/index_en.htm)
- European Agency for Safety and Health at Work: Open Access <http://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/factsheets>
- ETSC, <http://www.etsc.eu/home.php>
- Global Transfer Knowledge Partnership, <http://www.gtkp.com/>
- IRAP, <http://www.irap.net/>
- GRSP <http://www.grsproadsafety.org/>
- Make Roads Safe (FIA): Open Access <http://www.makeroadssafe.org/Pages/home.aspx>
- Transportation Research Board: Open Access <http://www.trb.org/Publications/Public/Publications.aspx>

## References

- <sup>1</sup> DfT (2010) Reported Road Casualties Great Britain 2009, TSO, London  
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/adobepdf/162469/221412/221549/227755/rrcgb2009.pdf>
- <sup>2</sup> <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/statistics/datatablespublications/accidents/casualtiesgbar/rrcgb2009>
- <sup>3</sup> This is an indication figure provided by DfT and is subject to a large degree of uncertainty.
- <sup>4</sup> Based on an exchange rate of 1 U.S. dollar = 0.630119723 British pounds
- <sup>4</sup> Based on an exchange rate of 1 U.S. dollar = 0.630119723 British pounds
- <sup>5</sup> <http://www.roadsafetyanalysis.org/>
- <sup>6</sup> <http://www.dft.gov.uk/adobepdf/162469/221412/221549/227755/rrcgb2009.pdf>
- <sup>7</sup> <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roadsafety/rspg/rspg.pdf>
- <sup>8</sup> <http://www.wyltp.com/currentplan/saferroads>
- <sup>9</sup> Although emergency budgets have altered this.
- <sup>10</sup> <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roadsafety/rspg/rspg.pdf>
- <sup>11</sup> <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roadsafety/rspg/rspg.pdf>
- <sup>12</sup> <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roadsafety/rspg/rspg.pdf>
- <sup>13</sup> United nations (2010) "Improving Global Road Safety: Setting Regional and National Road Traffic Casualty Reduction Targets", United Nations Regional Commissions, New York
- <sup>14</sup> Wong, S.C., N.N. Sze (2010) Is the effect of quantified road safety targets sustainable? To appear in Safety Science and presented at SWOV Workshop Scientific Research on Road Safety Management, Haarlem, November 2009
- <sup>15</sup> United nations (2010) "Improving Global Road Safety: Setting Regional and National Road Traffic Casualty Reduction Targets", United Nations Regional Commissions, New York
- <sup>16</sup> WHO (2004), World Report on road traffic injury prevention, World Health Organisation, Geneva.
- <sup>17</sup> OECD (2002), Safety on the Roads: What's the Vision?, Road Transport Research Series, OECD, Paris
- <sup>18</sup> Besley (2010) Beyond 2010 : Taking Stock and Moving Forward, PACTS, London  
<http://www.pacts.org.uk/docs/pdf-bank/Beyond%202010%20-%20Taking%20Stock%20and%20Moving%20Forward%20.pdf>
- <sup>19</sup> Broughton J (2010) 'Post 2010 Casualty Forecasting' PPR 444, TRL, Crowthorne, HIS, Bracknell
- <sup>20</sup> DTLR (2001) Road Accidents Great Britain:2000 The Casualty Report, TSO, London
- <sup>21</sup> PACTS (2010) POLICY BRIEFING - A VISION FOR ROAD SAFETY, PACTS, London  
<http://pacts.org.uk/docs/pdf-bank/POLICY%20BRIEFING%20-%20Road%20Safety%20Performance%20Beyond%202010%20v3.pdf>
- <sup>22</sup> <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/ltg/guidance/localtransportplans/>
- <sup>23</sup> <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/ltg/guidance/localtransportplans/>
- <sup>24</sup> DfT (2004) Assessing the Casualty Reduction performance of Local Highway Authorities, HMSO, London
- <sup>25</sup> [http://www.conservatives.com/News/News\\_stories/2010/05/Coalition\\_Agreement\\_published.aspx](http://www.conservatives.com/News/News_stories/2010/05/Coalition_Agreement_published.aspx)
- <sup>26</sup> <http://programmefor.government.hmg.gov.uk/>
- <sup>27</sup> [http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2010/10/Philip\\_Hammond\\_government\\_announces\\_plans\\_for\\_next\\_phase\\_of\\_high\\_speed\\_rail.aspx](http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2010/10/Philip_Hammond_government_announces_plans_for_next_phase_of_high_speed_rail.aspx)
- <sup>28</sup> [http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/spending\\_review\\_framework\\_080610.pdf](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/spending_review_framework_080610.pdf)
- <sup>29</sup> [http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/junebudget\\_complete.pdf](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/junebudget_complete.pdf)
- <sup>30</sup> [http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend\\_index.htm](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/spend_index.htm)
- <sup>31</sup> Hawkins, Ross (19 July 2010). "Will the "big society" help big cuts?" BBC News
- <sup>32</sup> <http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/407789/building-big-society.pdf>
- <sup>33</sup> [http://www.politics.co.uk/legislation/communities-and-local-government/decentralisation-and-localism-bill-\\$21378416.htm](http://www.politics.co.uk/legislation/communities-and-local-government/decentralisation-and-localism-bill-$21378416.htm)
- <sup>34</sup> <http://www.communities.gov.uk/speeches/newsroom/1710003>
- <sup>35</sup> <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/corporate/pdf/16359212.pdf>
- <sup>36</sup> <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-10723343>
- <sup>37</sup> <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-10911436>
- <sup>38</sup> <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmselect/cmtran/359/10072602.htm>
- <sup>39</sup> [http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/press\\_04\\_10.pdf](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/press_04_10.pdf)
- <sup>40</sup> <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roadsafety/rspg/rspg.pdf>
- <sup>41</sup> <http://www.roadsafetygb.org.uk/news/618.html>

- 
- 42 [http://www.mikepenning.com/17062010\\_transport\\_questions](http://www.mikepenning.com/17062010_transport_questions)
- 43 <http://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/motoring/motoring-news/the-cuts-victim-that-wont-provoke-any-tears-speed-cameras-2035411.html>
- 44 <http://www.euroncap.com/home.aspx>
- 45 Owen R. (2010) The Big Speed Camera Switch Off: One Month On, Thames Valley Safer Roads Partnership
- 46 <http://www.pacts.org.uk/docs/pdf-bank/snbt-00350.pdf> .
- 47 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651985.cd004607.pdf>
- 48 <http://download.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/efficiency/sirphilipgreenreview.pdf>
- 49 <http://www.publichealthcommission.co.uk/pdfs/AboutPHC/ResponsibilityDeal.pdf>
- 50 <http://www.1010global.org/uk>
- 51 <http://www.roadsafetyevaluation.com/>
- 52 <http://www.ebay.co.uk/>
- 53 <http://www.toptable.com/venue/?id=3772>
- 54 <http://www.parliament.uk/briefingpapers/commons/lib/research/briefings/snpc-05687.pdf>
- 55 <http://www.mysociety.org/about/>
- 56 [http://www.unlockdemocracy.org.uk/?page\\_id=1520](http://www.unlockdemocracy.org.uk/?page_id=1520)
- 57 [http://sei-international.org/mediamanager/documents/Publications/Future/vision\\_zero\\_FinalReport\\_March06.pdf](http://sei-international.org/mediamanager/documents/Publications/Future/vision_zero_FinalReport_March06.pdf)
- 58 RAC (2007) RAC Report on motoring 2007 – Driving Safely? RAC, London [http://files.the-group.net/library/rac/files/pdf\\_1741.pdf](http://files.the-group.net/library/rac/files/pdf_1741.pdf)
- 59 <http://www.1010global.org/uk/people/cut>
- 60 Chart taken from Besley (2010) Beyond 2010 : Taking Stock and Moving Forward, PACTS, London <http://www.pacts.org.uk/docs/pdf-bank/Beyond%202010%20-%20Taking%20Stock%20and%20Moving%20Forward%20.pdf> using data from and <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/STATBASE/ssdataset.asp?vlnk=6515> and <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/statistics/datatablespublications/accidents/casualtiesgbar/>