

## Introduction

CSS welcomes 'A Safer Way' and the refreshment of efforts to continue the reduction of casualties on Britain's roads. It will welcome the opportunity to play a central role, through involvement in the Road Safety Delivery Board and as a channel of communication between DfT and local practitioners. Local authorities will remain keen to research and implement initiatives of all kinds to bring about casualty reduction. DfT's support, through the delivery of sufficient resources, will be crucial. Brief responses to specific questions posed in 'A Safer Way' are set out below, but CSS would welcome more detailed dialogue around these, and around some of the areas which it is felt could receive more attention. Of particular interest are:-

- The availability of resources

CSS would wish to press Government to ensure that adequate levels of 'base' funding via block allocations and Specific Road Safety Grant remain in place, supplemented where appropriate by Road Safety Partnership Grant or other initiatives.

- Motorcyclists

It is felt that the strategy could give more prominence to motorcyclists, recognising that they raise some very different issues to other road users, requiring an understanding of the behaviour of groups and the taking of risk. They also raise, alongside some other user groups, issues around inappropriate speed and how this can be tackled.

- Partnership working

A sophisticated approach is required to deliver further improvements in road safety, encompassing research, education, training and publicity, engineering and enforcement. Numerous agencies need to be involved, and a coherent national road safety strategy must recognise, encourage and facilitate this.

# Appendix C: List of questions

## Vision and targets (Chapters 3 and 8)

1. Do you agree that our vision for road safety should be to have the safest roads in the world? (Chapter 3)

**There is a view amongst practitioners that this terminology suggests a focus on highway infrastructure, and that the vision should relate to the 'safest road users' or 'safest road safety system'. However, the objective of being a 'world leader' in safety is a shared one.**

2. Do you agree that we should define a strategy running over twenty years to 2030, but with review points after five and ten years? (Chapter 3)

**Yes**

3. Do you agree that our targets should be to reduce:
  - road deaths by at least 33 per cent by 2020 compared to the baseline of the 2004–08 average number of road deaths;

**Yes. However, it is stressed that DfT must note the volatility of the number of fatalities at local level, and that this should not become regarded as a local target separate to those for KSI casualties.**

- the annual total of serious injuries on our roads by 2020 by at least 33 per cent;

**Yes, but at local level the use of KSI should be retained rather than separate indicators and targets.**

- the annual total of road deaths and serious injuries to children and young people (aged 0–17) by at least 50 per cent against a baseline of the 2004-08 average by 2020;

**There is some concern over the use of an age group including one year-group of young drivers. DfT is requested to consider whether clarity in dealing with these might be improved by the adoption of separate targets for pre- and post-17 age groups.**

- by at least 50 per cent by 2020 the rate<sup>1</sup> of KSI per km travelled by pedestrians and cyclists, compared with the 2004–08 average? (Chapter 8) –

**There is some concern that, even at national level, there is no comprehensive and consistent measure of distance travelled against which casualties can be monitored. The objective of measuring exposure to risk is sensible, but it will not be possible to do this for specific locations, so it will not lead to better focussing of interventions, simply to a new way of monitoring trends.**

4. We are proposing a set of indicators in order to help us to monitor performance (Appendix A). Do you believe these cover the right areas? (Chapter 8)

**Yes, but there are some comments and queries over the detail:-**

- **See above for comments relating to KPIs 1, 2 and 3**
- **KPI9; it is queried whether this can be covered consistently without requiring analysis out of proportion to the relative size of the problem**
- **KPI10; would it not be appropriate to use KSI as the indicator?**

## Context (Chapters 2, 3 and 4)

5. We have identified a number of factors that may affect our ability to deliver road safety improvements in the future world we are planning for. Do you think we have taken account of the key risks and opportunities? Are there others you would add? (Chapter 3) –

**It is suggested that a better understanding needs to be built over the influences on road safety of increased traffic congestion and of the growing number of older drivers. Continual attention will also be needed to the potential distractions of in-vehicle technologies and to whether improved vehicle safety leads to compensatory changes in (riskier) driver behaviour.**

6. We think that the key challenge for road safety from 2010 is better and more systematic delivery, rather than major policy changes. Do you

---

<sup>1</sup> Expressed as a three-year rolling average

agree? (Chapter 4)

**Yes. There is no reason for major changes in policy, but there is a need for continual attention to trends in driver behaviour alongside attention to highway infrastructure.**

**CSS believes that the skills and commitment required to deliver the appropriate elements of the strategy are in place within local authorities and road safety partnerships. They do, though, need the certainty of adequate resources being made available in order to develop implementation plans.**

7. This consultation document sets out the current evidence on the key road safety challenges. Do you agree with our analysis? Would you highlight any others? (Chapter 2)

**There is reason to include more detailed consideration of road user behaviour, on issues such as drug use, poor eyesight, and mobile phone use. Alongside these there could be merit in highlighting the issues around use of the highway for leisure purposes (especially by motorcyclists), the 'deliberate' taking of risk and the influence of groups on individual behaviour.**

## New performance framework (Chapters 4 and 8)

8. We are proposing a number of measures to support the effectiveness of the road safety profession. Do you think they will be effective? What else might need to be done? (Chapter 4)

**The proposals are welcome. It is suggested that the independent expert panel takes steps to encourage feedback from practitioners. In common with comments elsewhere in this response, a strengthening of work on road-user behaviour is regarded as worthwhile.**

9. Do you agree that an independent annual report on road safety performance, created on an annual basis, would be a worthwhile innovation? (Chapter 4)

**Yes**

10. Do you agree that the Road Safety Delivery Board should be tasked with holding Government and other stakeholders to account on the implementation of a new national road safety plan? (Chapter 8)

**Yes, but for the benefit of all parties clarity is required over the roles of the board, the expert panel, DfT and other practitioners.**

## Roads and local authorities (Chapter 5)

11. Do you agree that highway authorities reviewing and, where appropriate, reducing speed limits on single carriageway roads will be an effective way of addressing the casualty problem on rural roads? Are there other ways in which the safety of rural roads can be improved? (Chapter 5) –

**The reviewing of speed limits is an ongoing activity which has an important role to play. However, it needs to be undertaken in combination with measures to reduce the severity of those incidents which do occur. It is also essential to incorporate education and enforcement measures in recognition of the involvement of inappropriate speeds (not necessarily exceeding the legal limit).**

12. How can we most effectively promote the implementation of 20 mph zone schemes in residential areas? What other measures should we be encouraging to reduce pedestrian and cyclist casualties in towns? (Chapter 5)

**Enforcement and public acceptability will remain crucial to the success of 20mph zones. Without widespread public acceptability and adherence they will only be feasible through extensive and expensive engineering measures. They must, therefore, be seen as a package of measures centred upon local community engagement.**

13. How can we provide better support to highway authorities in progressing economically worthwhile road safety engineering schemes? (Chapter 5)

**Local authorities would support work to strengthen their ability to learn from the experience of others in order to ensure best value in the selection of interventions. This will apply to engineering measures but also to the evaluation of the role of education and enforcement in combination with these.**

## Vehicles (Chapter 6)

14. What should Government do to secure greater road safety benefits from vehicles?

**Attention will be needed to the influences on driver behaviour of in-vehicle technologies, to ensure that safer vehicles do not lead to riskier driving and/or adverse consequences for pedestrians and cyclists. Support would be worthwhile for research into technologies able to detect fatigue or other facets of driver behaviour.**

15. Do you agree that, in future, crash avoidance systems will grow in

importance and will have the potential to greatly reduce casualties?

**Yes, but evaluation must track whether drivers adopt riskier behaviour in response.**

16. How can we best encourage consumers to include safety performance in their purchasing decisions?

**Codes of conduct for advertising would play a role. It would also be beneficial, though, for essential safety features to be required as standard rather than optional extras.**

## Behaviours (Chapter 7)

17. We have highlighted what we believe to be the most dangerous driving behaviours. Do you agree with our assessment?

**Yes, but factors including fatigue and inappropriate use of in-vehicle electronics (communications and navigation systems) are also valid.**

18. What more can be done to persuade the motoring public that illegal and inappropriate speeds are not acceptable behaviours?

**There is an important role for employers in encouraging and enforcing their employees to adopt responsible behaviour, and for Government to persuade them to adopt a proactive stance.**

**Further education of road-users would be beneficial over the consequences of inappropriate speed, and it is worth considering the extent to which this can be targeted at high-risk groups.**

**It would be beneficial to continue work to combine education and training with enforcement (offered as alternatives to fines and licence penalties).**

**The development of intelligent speed adaptation systems would be assisted by the existence of a comprehensive national speed limit database.**

19. What more can be done to encourage safe and responsible driving?

**Further THINK! campaigns would be supported. The limits on police ability to provide a visible enforcement presence is a concern.**

20. Should more be done to reward good driving? If so, what?

**There is evidence that suitable technologies exist to monitor vehicle use, and potential exists to reward this through lower insurance premiums. A voluntary intelligent speed adaptation system linked to these incentives would have significant benefits.**