

AGENDA ITEM: 9

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

6th MAY 2008

**COMMUNITY SAFETY and LEISURE
SCRUTINY PANEL**

“SPEED CAMERAS”

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1 The purpose of this report is to present the Community Safety and Leisure Scrutiny Panel's assessment and proposals on Speed Cameras in relation to the agreed Terms of Reference of the Scrutiny.

OVERALL AIM OF THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

- 2 The overall aim of the Scrutiny Investigation was to assess the issues associated with Speed Cameras and make appropriate recommendations which would address the areas of concern outlined in the Terms of Reference.
- 3 To present the findings of the Scrutiny Investigation to the Executive for their consideration.

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE SCRUTINY INVESTIGATION

- 4 The Following outlines the **Terms of Reference** which formed the basis of the Panels enquiries. These Terms of Reference are based on the discussions resulting from the Panels' initial discussion and consideration on 5th December 2007.
- What evidence was there that speed cameras reduced the number of accidents?
 - What were the issues regarding claims that Speed cameras were primarily for income generation?

BACKGROUND

- 5 The Panel considered the issues associated with this subject and addressed the core question of asking what is the purpose of having, what is generally termed as, Speed Cameras. Are Speed Cameras installed to penalise drives who either inadvertently or deliberately exceed the speed limits and thereby bring income to the Exchequer, or are they to influence behaviour and calm traffic speed through means of enforcement. It was found that the AA were criticised by Transport 2000 for publishing the location of Speed Cameras as this would alert drivers to areas where they need to slow down to escape fines. Such a response brings forth the question of the purpose of installing a camera if not to actually slow down traffic. Consequently, the Panel determined their Terms of Reference with the aim of addressing these issues.
- 6 The Panel was appraised that Speed Cameras are situated to reduce accidents. With this objective, the Panel was informed that UK roads were surveyed in 2006-07 in trials jointly funded by the Highways Agency and the IAM Motoring Trust. The Euro-RAP (Road Assessment Programme) single largest study of British roads found that single carriageway roads have six times the collision rate of motorways and double that of dual carriageways.
- 7 The Panel recognised that Speed Cameras do influence driver's behaviour and reduce speed through the threat of enforcement, as the evidence would indicate they do. However, their effectiveness compared with other means of traffic calming through road design and signage which achieved the objective or reducing accidents and casualties was brought to the Panels attention as a more effective alternative.
- 8 The Euro-Rap analysis found that bad driving can cause an accident, but bad road design can equally result in a fatality. Presently, 40% of roads are classified as inadequate and 66% of road deaths in the UK are on rural roads. What became evident through this research was that many accidents are from law abiding drivers who make an honest mistake, an error of judgement which resulted in hitting a fixed structure such as a tree, lamp post, telegraph pole or sign which inflicted injury.

- 9 There has been substantial research into the various initiatives, which aim to tackle these issues and reduce traffic accidents and casualties while maintaining traffic flow. The Panel commenced with the intention to question the effectiveness of Speed Cameras which in effect are a deterrent but also only become activated once a vehicle has passed the potentially danger zone. Hence, if the intention is to deter speeding or reduce accidents, are Speed cameras the most effective or appropriate tools.
- 10 Again, from the 2007 Road Assessment Programme it was concluded that Speed cameras can reduce the risk of an accident by up to 10% yet improved road marking and signage can reduce the risk of accident up to 35%. Hence the Panel decided that it would receive evidence from areas which adopt the different approaches to traffic management and road safety.

PANELS SCRUTINY EXAMINATION

- 11 The subject area of Speed Cameras was selected by the Councils Overview and Scrutiny Board and directed to this Panel. Consequently the Panel agreed its Terms of Reference and commenced its enquiries in February 2008.
- 12 When setting the Terms of Reference the Panel recognised that the examination into this subject has to be placed into perspective. In doing this, the Panel wanted to establish the purpose and effectiveness of installing Speed Cameras. Consequently the Panels investigation is relating to how effective Speed Cameras are to reducing accidents and therefore casualties. The Panel was also aware that there are a number of factors, which contribute towards motor accidents, and exceeding the statutory speed limits represents only a very small percentage according to national statistics from the DoT. The Panel believed there was a link between speed and accidents. And wanted to receive evidence in relation to this. The Panel also wanted to explore a range of factors, which were considered would impact on reducing speed and / or increase driver's awareness to the various dangers on the road and how these compared to the use of Speed cameras.
- 13 The Panel decided it would hold a half-day meeting and invite a number of organisations, which could present different perspectives based on the experiences in their areas. From this premise it was decided that as Cleveland used fixed Speed Cameras and Durham did not, It was appropriate that representatives from these two areas should be invited to attend in order that the Panel could balance and question the two different approaches. A meeting was held on the 4th February which had representatives from
 - i. Cleveland Strategic Road Safety Partnership
 - ii. Cleveland police
 - iii. Middlesbrough Police division
 - iv. Middlesbrough Council
 - v. Durham Police

vi. Durham County Council

14 From this meeting the Panel considered it would like to receive information from two additional organisations and a meeting was held on 13th February to receive this evidence. The organisations were

- vii. Local Authority Road Safety Officers Organisation
- viii. University of Teesside

15 Following these two meetings the Panel considered it had received sufficient information to draft their findings into a report for submission to OSB. Primarily the findings did address the initial Terms of Reference, however some issues which brought the subject matter of cameras into comparison with alternative measures were also addressed and are referenced in this report.

Middlesbrough Council

16 Middlesbrough Council set the scene by advising the Panel on the many ways traffic was controlled such as speed humps, traffic lights, speed limits, road design, road policing etc. It was also conveyed to the Panel that there is a strong link between speed and both the frequency and severity of accidents. The Panel was informed that there are three definitions associated with speed

- Excess speed (up to 10 MPH above speed limit)
- Excessive speed (15 MPH above the speed limit)
- Inappropriate speed (too fast for road conditions – yet within the speed limit)

17 It was conveyed to the Panel that Speed Cameras are only one way of managing speed and that “Education” was a key message. It was appreciated that often road safety issues are targeted towards young children, however, there is now a greater emphasis being directed towards young drivers in the form of education, as this is seen as a vulnerable sector of drivers.

18 The Executive Member for Transport informed the Panel that there was evidence that road engineering/design does change traffic characteristics and does slow down traffic. Actions in Middlesbrough have seen reductions in fatalities and over the last 18 months and Middlesbrough has only incurred one fatality as a result of a traffic accident during this period. With regard to cameras generally, it was stated to the Panel that Middlesbrough has two “Red light” cameras operating within its boundaries to record offending motorists. On occasion a mobile speed camera will be deployed in areas where concerns have been identified. For additional information the Panel were told that where roadside speed camera signs were deployed, this means that a speed camera can be situated there at any time.

Cleveland Strategic Safety Camera Partnership

- 19 The Cleveland Strategic Safety Camera Partnership comprises a number of organisations and was established in 2000 as one of eight pilot schemes nationally. The Panel was apprised of where income raised through fines from speed cameras was directed and this is referenced later in the report.
- 20 The Panel was also informed that there are now specific targets for reducing road accidents and that organisations like the CSSCP contribute towards achieving that reduction. The targets for 2010 are outlined below and set against a base established as the average incidents between 1994/98.
- 40% reduction in number of people killed/seriously injured
 - 50% reduction in number of children killed/seriously injured
 - 10% reduction in the slight casualty rate
- 21 The Panel was informed that sites chosen for fixed speed camera location were based on the evidence that a high number of injury collisions had occurred together with a stretch of road associated with a speed problem. While temporary sites are selected based on complaints from residents or Councillors as having a traffic speed problem. Hence temporary cameras are used to ascertain the degree of the problem and calm the area for a period of time. However, camera locations are now selected as a preventative measure and not necessarily based on factors such as high incidents of fatal or serious accidents. The result of this is that cameras can now be installed on areas of road considered to have the potential for road accidents.
- 22 The partnership advised the Panel that although there is a significant increase in the deployment of speed cameras, having a consequential increase in the number of hours used from 1222 hours per month in 2005 to 2278 hours per month in 2007. The number of detection's has fallen from an average of 1466 per month in 2005 to 1207 in 2007 which the partnership consider is due to drivers being more responsible regarding road safety. Presently 96% of all speed enforcement in the UK is through the use of speed cameras. The partnership presented to the Panel that speed camera monitored roads have had a reduction from 293 to 130 injury collisions over the last 7 years. This has resulted in an estimated financial reduction to society of around £79 million. With an almost corresponding 50% reduction in the issue of speeding tickets during the same period. In financial terms the Partnership has cost around £7million to operate during that 7-year period giving a return of 11:1 on expenditure against the 5:1 initially forecasted of the scheme. The Panel was informed that research undertaken by the University College of London had concluded that the speed camera scheme had achieved its main objectives.
- 23 A summary of the key points raised by the Camera Partnership are presented below
- Injury collisions have reduced by 56%

- 14% reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured
- 29% reduction in all classes of injury (against the 1994 baseline)
- a financial saving of £78.9 million over 7 years
- a 2.4 mph reduction in average traffic speeds
- a 96% compliance with speed limits
- less than 1% of injury collisions were caused by speed
- a 52% decrease in the number of tickets issued from 2000 – 2007
- the average number of camera hours deployed per month almost doubled, from 1,222 hours to 2,278 hours)
- public support of safety cameras is running at 78%

CLEVELAND POLICE

- 24 Cleveland Police conveyed to the Panel that their main focus in relation to road safety was to reduce the number of collisions. The Road Policing Unit was not in place to address safety cameras but to address the following five priorities: -
- (i) denying criminal access to the road and/or driving (i.e. Drivers influenced by drink or drugs)
 - (ii) reduction of road casualties
 - (iii) tackling the threat of terrorism
 - (iv) tackling anti social use of the road (e.g. – un-taxed or insured, or off road motorbikes, public nuisance matters)
 - (v) enhancing public confidence, by ensuring police presence in ‘hot spots’.
- 25 All fatal and serious collisions were attended to by the Road Policing Unit and drivers under the influence of drink and drugs are the main focus for the Road Policing unit. The Panel was informed that all cars within the Road Policing Unit had the ability to catch speeding drivers, as all these cars carried recording equipment and video recorded offenders which later can be used to evidence the actions of the speeding motorist.
- 26 The Panel was informed that in 2004, there had been 34 fatalities on Cleveland roads, but this had reduced to 15 fatalities by 2007. Other motoring crimes the Police were involved with in 2007 included 478 arrests for driving under the influence of drink and/or drugs, 134 arrests for driving whilst disqualified and over 200 arrests for public order motoring offences.
- 27 Cleveland Police conveyed that it was their opinion that Speed Cameras were of great value as a deterrent in Cleveland, in that the majority of collisions involved inappropriate or excessive speed as a factor. The Police stated that this was especially where vehicles were taking a bend and lost control of the vehicle, and hit a tree or other structure.

- 28 The Police outlined that they would support all campaigns that targeted road safety, especially as road safety depended on enforcement, engineering and education. Every speeding complaint received by the section was investigated and a police vehicle deployed to the area to observe the situation and catch speeding vehicles, as necessary. Cleveland Police conveyed to the Panel that for some persistent offenders, enforcement was the only way to control their driving behaviour.
- 29 Cleveland Police fully supported speed information cameras, which would provide information to drivers in advance of a situation or hot spot areas, but considered that motorists soon became aware that there was no prosecution and some drivers then tended to ignore the signs.
- 30 In relation to enforcement and punishment, persistent offenders were offered a Speed Awareness Course (also some offending at 35-39 mph), as an alternative to going to court, for which a charge was applied for attending this course. The Police concluded that there had been a great deal of progress in addressing speed awareness over the last three years in Cleveland, resulting in a substantial reduction in the number of casualties.

DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL

- 31 The County Council outlined to the Panel where a number of accidents had occurred with a prominence of country roads, sharp bends, T junctions etc and emphasised that young drivers with limited experience have a disproportionate number of accidents relative to the number of licence holders. In endeavours to tackle these errors in judgement, Durham County Council has implemented the National Safety Awareness Course and also devised and operates a driving course for elderly drivers. These initiatives are in addition to child pedestrian training, post test training and motorcycle training, all currently available in Durham.
- 32 Durham have found substantial reductions in accident hot spots through the application of improved signage, luminous road markings, improved lighting and road design (e.g. specific right hand lanes). Also the introduction of collapsible road sign uprights, and lampposts had contributed to a reduction in casualties compared to the use of ridged structures.
- 33 Analysis by the County Council had found that a common factor in accidents was driver attitude. A high proportion being associated with young male drivers and tests were now taken at fatal accident scenes for drugs and alcohol. The County Council now employs a Youth Engagement Officer solely to encourage young drivers to attend driving courses as a mean to reduce the possibility of an accident through greater awareness and driver behaviour.
- 34 Durham operate the National Speed awareness scheme which offered offenders the opportunity to attend a driving course which would aim to increase their understanding of road dangers and the consequences of their actions. The incentive for drivers to attend is that attendance would also

cancel the prosecution and penalty points they would otherwise be credited with. The Panel was informed that Durham considered that there was evidence that drivers attitude did change as a result of the course and that this means of prevention was more effective for many drivers than simply issuing penalty points.

DURHAM POLICE

- 35 Durham Police informed the Panel of their approach to speed cameras in an area which is 80% rural covering 4.012km of roads. The Durham Road Safety strategy is targeted towards achieving the 2010 targets against the four main causes of road casualties. Which are
- Speed
 - Drink Driving
 - Driver fatigue
 - Non-use of restraints
- 36 Durham confirmed that they did not have any fixed speed cameras or a camera partnership and that they did not believe it was appropriate due to the road characteristics of the area. Where accidents had occurred and unfortunately resulted in fatalities analysis had shown that there was not a pattern which would lead to support camera installations. Road traffic speed was controlled by other methods, which in the County of Durham were found to be very effective.
- 37 To illustrate the relationship of speed against causalities the Police outlined that of the 38 fatalities in 2002 18% were linked to excessive speed, however 40% of accidents were caused by drivers under the influence of drugs. Consequently the Durham Police conveyed to the Panel that it is too simplistic to say accidents were all about speed and added that only 3.5% of accidents in Durham were associated with drivers exceeding the speed limit. Consequently, it was conveyed to the Panel that Durham aim to take a preventative approach which would achieve the desired result of reducing casualties through signage, education, street engineering and where appropriate the use of temporary cameras to ascertain the problems of a specific area.

LOCAL AUTHORITY ROAD SAFETY OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

- 38 LARSOA is represented in 185 of the 200 Local Authorities in England and produces policies and statements which are adopted by Local Authorities in relation to Rural Road Safety, Safety Cameras and other general traffic and road safety issues.
- 39 LARSOA supports the 4E principles associated with road safety of Education, Environment, Encouragement and Enforcement with specific endorsement of Encouragement and Education. However, it was conveyed to the Panel that

Engineering had made a substantial impact on casualty reduction in recent years. Their research had found that the majority of accidents on rural roads were associated with single car, male driver, usually leaving the road due to excessive speed and hitting an immovable object. However, these incidents are not necessarily due to exceeding the speed limit, simply an error of judgement and travelling too fast for the conditions.

- 40 The Panel was informed that LARSOA does support the use of speed cameras and red light cameras as a means of enforcement. However, initiatives for enhanced driver awareness and the driver improvement courses have shown substantial improvement in road safety. LARSOA supports the advanced warning signs of speed camera operation, as it is the intention to slow driver's behaviour not to increase court appearances.
- 41 The Panel was advised that frequently, more than one action is required in an area for a road safety initiative to have a noticeable effect on speed and therefore securing the consequential benefits of reduced accidents and road casualties.
- 42 LARSOA outlined to the Panel that fatalities are more probable on rural roads than Motorways as there are less safety measures on rural roads and the likelihood of hitting a solid structure increases compared to Motorways or major trunk roads where various engineering safety measures are deployed. Generally, accidents on rural roads are due to travelling too fast for the conditions but not necessarily exceeding a speed limit where a camera would be activated. Consequently, LARSOA encourages improved education and behaviour modification where appropriate.

UNIVERSITY of TEESSIDE

- 43 A senior lecturer from the University conveyed to the Panel an outline of the research undertaken into collisions, pedestrian behaviour and the use of Safety/Speed Cameras. The Panel were informed that the University had consulted with North Yorkshire Police Collision Investigation officers to ascertain Police motivation behind the use of Safety/Speed cameras and confirmed that motivations were generally target led. The use of Speed Cameras was favoured as it released the use of Police resource to address other issues including Anti Social behaviour and was found to reduce speed in areas where the cameras were deployed.
- 44 Specific reference was made to the Panel regarding the issues and concerns of traffic outside schools where it was conveyed that environmental and engineering measures could frequently be introduced to reduce traffic speed in these vulnerable areas at a similar cost to installing a camera. Consequently, this approach had been taken by other local authorities but not every school in Middlesbrough had 20-MPH restrictions. It was the considered view of the Panel that Speed cameras were not a viable option outside schools and were more appropriate on roads similar to the A66. With regard to Schools the Panel was informed that there has not been any accidents in any of the 20mph zones already operating outside schools in Middlesbrough.

FUNDING

- 45 The Panel was informed by the Camera Partnership that changes to the funding were introduced in April 2007. Now Local authorities receive their funding through the Local Transport Plan process in the form of a specific grant. The grant is based on the individual road safety formula built into the Authorities Local Transport Plan and has no link to the income received from Speed Cameras.
- 46 The Panel was advised that there is significant public perception that Speed Cameras are solely to generate income and this is attributed to the amount of bad publicity on this topic, including that contained within two national daily papers. Additionally, the Panel was informed that there are local newspapers which have also criticised Speed Cameras and upon requests from the Strategic Safety Camera Partnership they have refused to publish any evidence that contradicted that standpoint, again fuelling public opinion.
- 47 The Panel discussed the issue of publicity and was informed that a 'wrap around' newspaper item had been produced by the Camera Partnership, at a cost of £16,000 and presented the value of Speed Cameras and that document had attracted excellent feedback from the public.

ADDRESSING THE "Terms of Reference"

- 48 The Panel addressed the Terms of Reference during their lines of enquiry and an outline of their findings is as follows: -

1. What evidence was there that speed cameras reduced the number of accidents?

The Panel found that there was evidence that Speed Cameras have affected Drivers attitude and reduced speed. The Panel found that while the numbers of Speed Cameras have increased the number of penalties issued has reduced which is one measure of speed reduction and the effectiveness of Speed Cameras. However, The Panel considered that Speed Cameras are only one aspect of a range of initiatives, which contribute towards having safer roads and reduced accidents/fatalities.

The Panel found that while speed is a factor in the majority of incidents. However, this is primarily inappropriate speed for the conditions and not exceeding the speed limit where a camera would be activated. Consequently, while the Panel appreciates that the Speed Camera does provide a deterrent and is a means of applying a penalty there are other mechanisms, which are more effective in achieving the objective to reduce incidents and casualties.

The Panel found that initiatives which targeted behaviour modification through education and awareness, and providing alternative speed awareness courses added to appropriate road design, road markings, lighting and signage made a greater contribution towards the reduction in casualties.

2. What were the issues regarding claims that Speed cameras were primarily for income generation?

The Panel found that fines generated from Speed Cameras were at one time directed to the Department of Transport and partnerships submitted a claim to run the Partnership. However, from the 1st April 2007 significant changes were introduced in the way the partnerships are funded. Since that date income from Speed cameras is directed to the Department of Transport. The Local Transport Plan contains the road safety formula from which is calculated the grant to be attributed to that specific area. The Panel found this method of reimbursement destroyed the view that Speed Cameras are installed today as a means to generate income.

CONCLUSION

- 49 Based on evidence presented to the Panel, the Panel found that the installation of fixed Speed cameras is not about income generation and their purpose is directly about traffic calming, with the objective to reduce road casualties. The Panel considered that to achieve this the logical approach is the one currently taken by ensuring appropriate signage is installed and that cameras are obvious with the appropriate colouring to effectively alert motorists and prevent excess speed through areas known to be subject to accidents. The Panels view is that the use of covert cameras is essentially to penalise someone after the incident and does very little to moderate behaviour and indeed can contribute to the alienation of drivers to the law enforcement authorities. Consequently, the Panel considers that prevention is significantly more appropriate than subsequent penalty notices and has greater impact on reducing potential accidents and injuries.
- 50 From the evidence received the Panel does not encourage the introduction of Speed Cameras as a matter of course. Middlesbrough has a good record in relation to minimal road traffic injuries/fatalities and the potential alienation by the public from the introduction of Speed Cameras against any anticipated benefit is in Middlesbrough's case not evidenced to date or supported by this Panel.
- 51 The Panel does conclude that traffic calming is a very important issue and is being taken seriously. However, the issue is one of reducing casualties not simply issuing fines. The Panel recognises that generally speed is a factor in the cause of accidents/collisions. However, as only a very small percentage of accidents occur when exceeding the statutory speed limits, the use of

cameras in achieving an overall reduction in casualties is also small when compared to other initiatives, which are targeted towards the same objective.

- 52 As the Panel looked at the general issue of traffic calming and effective alternatives to Speed Cameras. The Panel considered that traffic calming measures such as chicanes should be introduced as appropriate on estates and areas around schools as an alternative to Road Humps. The Panel considers that road humps deteriorate, require greater maintenance and are also particularly bad for bus and ambulance passengers.
- 53 The Panel considered Middlesbrough's Transport and Design unit is operating well in this respect and the issues of road design, general engineering and traffic management issues will have contributed positively to a reduction in casualties in Middlesbrough resulting in only one fatality over the last 18 months.
- 54 The Panel recognised that law abiding drivers do make mistakes. Poor judgement as so frequently termed "Human Error" does occur. Frequently while travelling within the speed limit but faster than is safe for the conditions. The consequences of such errors of judgement can result in physical injuries. The Panel considered that the approach to improve Road design, lighting, signage etc, linked with improved education will have greater impact on reducing road accidents and should be the main area of attention for improving road manners, awareness and judgement.
- 55 Continuing with the Panel's approach for improved awareness and modifying driver's behaviour. The Panel has only used the term Speed Camera in this report and not the increasingly popular term "Safety". This is purely that if a camera is to moderate speed with the aim of reducing potential accidents in high risk areas the term "Speed Camera" will have far greater impact on the motorist

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 56 The Panel appreciates that the Council has little direct control on the installation and application of Speed Cameras and that any recommendations made are with the intention to influence other agencies to consider the issues. With this knowledge the Panel presents its key recommendations to the Executive, which are outlined as follows: -
- A That the Panel would not support the installation of Fixed Speed cameras in Middlesbrough and where need exists to moderate speed mobile units with appropriate advanced signage be deployed
- B That behaviour modification as opposed to penalty points is considered will bring longer-term benefits. Consequently, That the opportunity for first time offenders to attend an educational course as an alternative to

receiving penalty points as a means of longer-term improvement be further promoted.

- C The term “Safety Camera” does not convey the same deterrent factor as “Speed Camera” and consequently to achieve the desired impact to slow drivers the term “Speed” should be used on all occasions.
- D That the Council undertake a survey of the traffic calming measures at the entrance of the schools in Middlesbrough. Measures such as chicanes, road humps, signage and use of cameras etc be recorded and the results of which are to be presented to the Panel within six months.
- E Future road design to slow traffic should aim to use chicanes in preference to road humps as this is considered a more effective way to slow traffic, requires less maintenance and reduces the impact on busses and emergency vehicles.
- F That the Councils Traffic dept aim, where appropriate, to introduce road signage, which is mounted on, crash collapsible pillars to reduce injury or fatality in the event of an accident.
- G That an article be presented in Middlesbrough News clarifying the issue of income from Speed cameras and also the reduction in road accident injuries over the last seven years in Middlesbrough.

CONSIDERATION to OSB

- 57 That the Overview and Scrutiny Board direct a Panel to examine the concerns of vehicles parking or stopping outside schools which obscure the vision of drivers and pedestrians and increases the vulnerability of children to accidents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 58 The Panel is grateful to all those who have presented evidence during the course of our investigation. We would like to place on record our appreciation, in particular the co-operation we have received from the following: -

B Glover	Middlesbrough Council
Coun Lowes	Middlesbrough Council
C Cole	Cleveland Strategic Road Safety Partnership
M Bennett	Middlesbrough Police/CSRSP
E Robinson	Cleveland police (Inspector)
D Nixon	Durham Police
D Wafer	Durham County Council

P Beveridge
A Kenedy

University of Teesside
Local Authority Road Safety Officers Association

COUNCILLOR SHAMAL BISWAS

CHAIR OF COMMUNITY SAFETY AND LEISURE SCRUTINY PANEL

APRIL 2008

Contact Peter Clark
Senior Scrutiny Officer
Performance and Policy Directorate
Telephone 01642 729708 (DDI)

BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 59 The following background papers were consulted or referenced to during this Scrutiny and in the compilation of this report:
- (a) Papers used for this analysis include
 - LARSOA documentation
 - How Policing affects road casualty (TRL limited for Transport of London)
 - FIA Foundation – Re Euro RAP
 - IAM Trust – Re EuroRAP
 - PACTS UK – Transport Safety Stats
 - AA Press releases
 - (b) Minutes of the Community Safety and Leisure Scrutiny Panels of 4th and 13th February, 5th and 26th March, 16th April 2008