

**Minutes of the Safer Roads Partnership  
Steering Group Meeting, held on the  
2<sup>nd</sup> December 2008**



**In Attendance:**

<b>Ian Medd (IM)(Chair)</b>	<b>Hampshire County Council</b>
<b>Tim Turner (TT)</b>	<b>Hampshire County Council</b>
<b>Ernie Sage (ES)</b>	<b>Hampshire County Council</b>
<b>Tom Niedrum (TN)</b>	<b>Hampshire County Council</b>
<b>Carol Bragshaw (CB)</b>	<b>Southampton City Council</b>
<b>John Gledhill (JG)</b>	<b>HM Courts Services</b>
<b>Adrian Parker (AP)</b>	<b>HM Courts Services</b>
<b>Peter Hughes (PH)</b>	<b>Hampshire Constabulary RPU</b>
<b>Angela Gild (AG)</b>	<b>Portsmouth City Council</b>
<b>Antoinette Cyriaano (AC)</b>	<b>Safer Roads Partnership</b>
<b>Marion Sinclair (MS)</b>	<b>Safer Roads Partnership</b>
<b>Julian Hewitt (JH)</b>	<b>Safer Roads Partnership</b>

**Apologies**

John Baldwin (Hampshire Constabulary CTO), Kevin Burton & Chris Bartlett (Isle of Wight Council), H C Hii (Southampton City Council), Richard Lumley & Jayne Rodgers (Portsmouth City Council), Paul Benham (Highways Agency), Jason Kirby & James Farr (Safer Roads Partnership).

**Welcome & Introduction**

The Chair (IM) welcomed everyone to the meeting after which there was a round table introduction.

**Minutes of the Safety Camera Partnership meeting held on the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2008**

These were accepted as being an accurate record of the meeting.

	<b>ACTIONS</b>
<p><b>Matters Arising from Minutes of Meeting held on the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2008</b></p> <p>1. Re 1.1: TN reported that 2 previous meetings had had to be rescheduled. Another meeting scheduled for 15<sup>th</sup> December would finalise the details of the Memorandum of Understanding with the legal teams. This would then be forwarded to all partners to be signed off. The aim is to have the document ready for the next Executive Board meeting on 8 January 2009.</p> <p>2. Re 1.2: MS reported on progress with the SLA working group. Work on the Terms of Reference and Service Level Agreement was still ongoing.</p> <p>3. Re 1.3: IM reported he was aware the Data Group were having meetings as he had received communication from members of the Group. The group agreed that progress had been made in identifying the objectives for the group and the correct people to be involved.</p> <p>4. Re 2: TT reported that all funds had been received. MS reminded TT of the budget information to be provided for the website.</p>	<p>TT</p>

<p>5. Re 3.2: MS updated the meeting on Partnership Operations. E &amp; Es were still being carried out. She had now contacted John Campbell, Assistant Chief Constable, to assist with resolving the issues of procurement of camera equipments. A report from Roger Price had been circulated with the minutes.</p> <p>6. Re 5.3: IM would follow up on his contact at Surrey University on the evaluation of SDSA. MS requested that any of their publications or reports be sent to the partnership.</p> <p>7. It was agreed to task the SLA group to include in the SLA, a strategy of exit and also a risk assessment for any member of the partnership leaving the partnership.</p> <p>8. MS said she had started a document on the proposal to enforce in 20mph zones, however, she was subsequently informed it was unnecessary as the RPU confirmed they were happy to enforce in these zones.</p>	<p>IM</p> <p>SLA Group</p>
<p><b>Item 1/2: Finances Overview/ Operational Case</b></p>	
<p>1. TN gave some background to what had necessitated the work that had been carried out on the partnership's finances. He reiterated the discussions from the last Executive Board Meeting where councils were reviewing their levels of funding into the partnership. There have since been a number of meetings with TT and MS to draw up the partnership's budget, making it as lean and mean as possible, adding DAT income as a source of partnership income and reviewing the cost-sharing mechanisms of the funding members.</p> <p>2. The proposed cost-sharing model has taken into consideration the views of members and is based on the number of routes and total casualties in the baseline years. This has offered the most pragmatic formula, with each local authority contributing a percentage as follows: Portsmouth – 12%, Isle of Wight – 13.9%, Southampton – 14% and Hampshire County Council – 60.1%. This formula removes the need for any one partner to be subsidised.</p> <p><u>The Budget Proposal</u>  The net cost of the partnership had been tweaked for cost-savings. Alternative options for the areas of Communication and Data Analysis, as suggested by the Executive Board, had been examined. However, there was not much duplication in both areas, and hence their positions remained unchanged.  The net budget has been reduced, and using the proposed formula, the proposed contributions of the funding members are: Portsmouth – £235K, Isle of Wight – £272K, Southampton – £274K, and Hampshire County Council – £1.2M.</p> <p>3. TN presented this proposal to the Steering Group, with the aim that it would be discussed and endorsed, before being forwarded to the Executive Board. The Chair asked if members were satisfied with the proposed cost-sharing model and willing to approve it. ES said Hampshire County Council was satisfied with it. AG on behalf of Portsmouth said she approved it in principle, with the aim that her Councillors, after looking at it would do</p>	

likewise. CB also said it looked fine to her and will forward her feedback to her Councillors. The IOW had given verbal support for the proposal to MS prior to the meeting and their specific comments were awaited. It was agreed that the proposal would be forwarded to respective councillors as a basis for budget approval.

MS advised the group that Paul Benham of the HA had advised that the HA will contribute £130K to the partnership this year, which could be carried over into the next financial year. A business case would be required to access funds from the Highways Authority in subsequent years. MS suggested that this money be earmarked for asset recovery – this to be considered and discussed by the Exec Boards. Thanks were expressed to HA for this contribution.

1. There was some discussion over the Village limits. TN explained that the Village 30 enforcement funds would be set up as a separate cost centre.
2. PH said at some point in time, there would have to be a discussion about joining up all the different areas together for long term view of casualty reduction and not have different pots of work.

MS explained that the village sites were being prioritised based on speed data. The Enforcement Database would continue be used, by both RPU and SRP, to store and show where enforcements had been carried out and the number of hours on the sites. That will ensure that there is communication between the teams, provided it is completed fully by RPU operatives.

3. There was a brief discussion about differentiating the different sources of the DAT income.

MS explained that the current cost sharing of DAT was a 50:50 percentage between the SRP and RPU, but that has been agreed to be pro-rata from October 2008.

### **Item 3: Partnership operations**

4. MS reported that
  - a calendar of E & Es had been circulated by Jason Kirby.
  - 2 camera vans have been ordered.
2. According to Roger Price's report on DAT, there was the potential to deliver more courses. They were in the process of developing courses targeted at mobile phone, seatbelt and red camera offenders.
3. There was ongoing work on signage at camera sites. IM said if there was any problem with signage with the new village limits, he could forward them to the right contact. MS reminded IM of Malcolm Smith's request, which could be a basis of further work.

**Item 4: Data analysis**

A Data Analysis report was handed out, which gave an update of the team’s work.

MS reported that the Data Group had held a very useful meeting with members and their line managers. It was agreed at the meeting that the RTI Report produced by the SRP needed input from the various data teams before being forwarded to the Steering Group. The RTI Report had been forwarded to the individual data teams for comments.

There was a brief discussion about the Data Group working with agreed baseline periods (3 years or 5 years), so that there was consistency across individual reports and analysis. It was agreed that this should be decided by the Data Group.

MS mentioned that the SRP data team was currently analysing data for the Force’s districts, which would be ready for the next Steering Group meeting, new software application permitting.

Data Group

**Item 5: Partnership Publicity and FOI**

JH reported on the activities of the publicity team.

1. **Safe Drive Stay Alive (SDSA):** The launch of SDSA took place on 11 November at Thornden Hall. Cllr Kendal and Cllr Fitzhenry attended as well as Andrew Howard of the AA. The launch received radio coverage on the day. All the SDSA events have received positive feedback. A number of SDSA events are planned in the future
  - Highbury College (Feb), Queen Mary College (8<sup>th</sup>), Alton College (11<sup>th</sup>), Havant College (26<sup>th</sup> Feb), Itchen College again (9<sup>th</sup> March) and a group of schools in Chandlers Ford.
2. **Christmas drink drive.** All authorities doing their own campaigns to supplement the national campaign. The Joint Initiative Group (JIG) agreed to look at the work IoW was doing to produce material that concentrated on the penalties associated with drink driving to see if they could be shared. JH said they had not carried out the usual Drink Drive campaign as data analysis reveals more drink related collisions occurred in the summer months. The JIG, meeting this afternoon, might decide to deliver this campaign later.
3. **Dashboard stickers:** This had been designed for van and goods vehicle drivers educating them about speed limits. Some had been given out at an RPU exercise operation Mermaid and to some individual companies. In the process of organising some collaboration with the Road Haulage Association.
4. **Enquiries:** A number of media speculations had resulted in enquiries about the position of Portsmouth and Southampton in the Partnership. Also a

<p>number of Freedom of Information requests had been received. There was an ongoing discussion about disclosing site specific data for mobile routes. A number of successful prosecutions resulted from partnership work in identifying motor cyclist using facial mapping techniques.</p> <p><b>5. Planned activities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly bulletin saying what has been done and also what is planned.</li> <li>• Radio advertising and sponsorship over Christmas, centred on the new advert.</li> <li>• Data group report to guide initiatives for next year.</li> <li>• Looking at follow up work for SDSA – supporting tutorials, providing learning materials, using blue tooth.</li> <li>• Articles for partnership publications – start off with SDSA.</li> <li>• Motorcycles vests (1000 vests) – Joint initiative with Bike Safe. These would be handed out at commuting times on roads where collisions had occurred involving motorcyclist who had not been seen. It would be combined with publicity in the media.</li> </ul> <p>There was a brief discussion on partnership campaigns to compliment not duplicate national and individual local authority campaigns. Also there was a suggestion for the JIG to have a Terms of Reference and SLA.</p> <p>ES reminded JH of the request for a cost breakdown of partnership publicity related activities. This would be sent to the Steering Group.</p>	<p>JH</p>
<p><b>**Closed Session**</b>  <b>There were no issues discussed under the closed session.</b></p>	
<p><b>Any Other Business</b>  PH highlighted the problem of motorist jumping red lights and at pedestrian crossings. He mentioned Junction 9 on the M27 as a particular location. There was a discussion about capturing evidence, possibly with CCTV cameras, at these locations. It was acknowledged that there might not be high casualty numbers however anecdotal reports suggest that this might be a problem. It was suggested that the JIG target this problem for an educational campaign as enforcement might not be the best solution.</p> <p>The Steering Group tasked the JIG to develop a publicity campaign to target crossings e.g. traffic lights and pedestrian crossings.</p>	<p>JIG</p>
<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b>  The next meeting will take place at the Safer Roads Partnership Conference Room on <b>Tuesday, 24<sup>th</sup> February, 2009</b> at 10am.</p>	