



Leeds
CITY COUNCIL

scrutiny



**Infrastructure,
Investment and
Inclusive Growth**

DRAFT INTERIM REPORT

Scrutiny Inquiry: Preventing People Being
Killed or Seriously Injured On Roads in Leeds

January 2022



Infrastructure, Investment & Inclusive Growth Scrutiny Board

Scrutiny Board Membership (2021/22):

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Cllr J Bentley | - Weetwood |
| Cllr N Buckley | - Alwoodley |
| Cllr Katie Dye | - Killingbeck & Seacroft |
| Cllr Bob Gettings | - Morley North |
| Cllr J Goddard | - Roundhay |
| Cllr A Hussain | - Gipton & Harehills |
| Cllr L Martin | - Roundhay |
| Cllr M Shahzad | - Moortown |
| Cllr N Sharpe | - Temple Newsam |
| Cllr J Taylor | - Horsforth |
| Cllr P Truswell (Chair) | - Middleton Park |
| Cllr P Wadsworth | - Guiseley & Rawdon |

Infrastructure, Investment & Inclusive Growth Scrutiny Board

Focusing on development and infrastructure functions and services to monitor progress in relation to transport and planning, regeneration and housing growth. The Board will also oversee economic growth functions and services to monitor progress towards being a strong and compassionate city, promoting opportunities for access to learning, skills and employment for all.

Queries in relation to this report can be directed to the Principal Scrutiny Officer supporting the inquiry:

Rebecca Atherton

 Becky.atherton@leeds.gov.uk

 0113 37 88642

Further information about the work of the committee can be found here:

[Infrastructure, Investment & Inclusive Growth Scrutiny Board](#)

For regular updates about Leeds City Council's Scrutiny Service follow us on Twitter:

 [@ScrutinyLeeds](#)



Contents

| | |
|------------------------|--------|
| Foreword | Page 1 |
| Summary | |
| Aims of the Inquiry | Page 2 |
| Recommendations | Page 3 |
| Part One | |
| Inquiry Approach | Page 5 |
| Part Two | |
| Examining the Evidence | Page 6 |



Foreword

Foreword from the Chair

Our Board heard powerful evidence from a range of partners and stakeholders during this Inquiry. All of them were passionate about preventing people from being killed or injured on our roads. The most compelling contributions came from parents who shared their heart-rending experiences about their children dying on our roads.

The words of those parent campaigners prompted wide ranging questions and debate. They encouraged Board members to rethink the language we use to discuss road safety: to stop talking about “accidents” and “casualty reduction” and to ensure victims are at the centre of any policies that aim to make our roads safer. They urged us to regard deaths and injuries on our roads as a public health challenge, rather than one relating purely to highways engineering, traffic management and enforcement.

It was clear that there is a huge willingness from those working on the ground to do whatever they can to prevent people dying or sustaining injuries on our roads.

Addressing the complex causes of road traffic collisions will undoubtedly require further resources to improve infrastructure, enforcement and in-car technology. However, securing national recognition of our “road safety emergency” is an immediate priority, along with empowering public, private and third sector partners to act together to maximise the impact of existing resources.

It is also clear that we need a robust programme of education that promotes both a behavioural shift in our approach to road safety and a collective intolerance of any complacency regarding the number of people dying or suffering injury on our roads.

I want to extend my sincere thanks on behalf of the Board to the campaigners, partners, and council officers and who contributed to the Board’s discussions. Your advice, expertise and experiences have been invaluable in enabling the Board to reach its conclusions.

Cllr Paul Truswell

Chair, Infrastructure, Investment & Inclusive Growth Scrutiny Board



Summary

1. Aims of the Inquiry

- To understand how the proposed adoption of Vision Zero could help partners prevent death and injury on roads in Leeds.

To specifically explore how partners could work together within this framework to:

- Improve the safety of road environments in local communities, particularly for vulnerable road users and young people.
- Make best use of technology and policy development to address dangerous behaviours
- Identify further opportunities to influence behaviour change.

2. Key Findings

- 2.1 The Scrutiny Board (Infrastructure, Investment and Inclusive Growth) fully endorsed the adoption of the proposed Vision Zero approach to road safety in Leeds, with the ambition at its heart that no one should be killed or seriously injured on our roads.
- 2.2 The Board agreed that delivering Vision Zero “should be everyone’s business.” This means that physical interventions, technological advances and enforcement activity must be supported by a programme of community engagement, communication and education that encourages a significant change in attitudes to road safety.

“Road traffic collisions are not inevitable. They are entirely preventable.”

- 2.3 Members advocated strengthening and extending existing partnership arrangements to maximise the impact of every pound spent on road safety. Stakeholders also agreed that genuine and constructive engagement with local communities was essential to develop a stronger evidence base to inform targeted road safety interventions.
- 2.4 Members supported campaigners’ views that we should move away from language that inadvertently implies that road deaths and injuries are inevitable. Our approach should be victim-centred and reflects the belief that collisions on the road are preventable.
- 2.5 The Scrutiny Board further recommended that road safety should be viewed as a public health challenge and that there should be visible political leadership on this issue at a city and regional level.
- 2.6 Full details of the Scrutiny Board’s deliberations and recommendations are set out below.



Summary

3. Recommendations

Recommendations to National Legislators

| | Recommendations to National Legislators | Ref |
|--|--|------|
| Road Safety criteria requirement for infrastructure investment | To recommend to Government that explicit road safety requirements form standard criteria in all transport infrastructure investment to promote scheme design in line with a Vision Zero approach. | 5.10 |
| National status of roads policing | To support the inclusion of roads policing within the strategic policing requirement to increase the visibility and status of this work. | 5.11 |
| Safety Camera Criteria | To advocate that the Department for Transport allows greater flexibility within a revised circular 1/2007 so as to enable the installation of safety cameras in response to emerging risk in addition to the existing 'high risk' criteria. To lobby Government to ensure the views of local elected representatives inform the consultation on a revised Department for Transport circular 1/2007. | 5.27 |
| Legislation regarding the use of handheld devices | To lobby Government to deliver legislative changes that that would enable the police to take direct enforcement action in any circumstances where drivers use handheld devices while at the wheel. | 5.40 |
| Requirements for new vehicle set up | To lobby Government to require manufacturers and re-sellers to demonstrate to consumers how in car technology can be used to restrict smartphone use to incoming hands-free calls while driving. | 5.43 |
| Graduated Driver Licence | To lobby government to reconsider the introduction of a graduated driver licence in the UK. | 5.71 |

Strengthening Local Operational Practice

| | Recommendations Regarding Local Practice | Ref |
|--|--|-----|
| Political leadership regionally | Ensure that there is clear, cross-party political leadership at a regional level with politicians represented on a Vision Zero Board. | 5.7 |
| Direct representation on Vision Zero Board | Co-opt representatives of victims of road death on to the proposed regional Vision Zero Board to ensure 'critical friend' challenge and placing them at the centre of policy making. | 5.7 |



Summary

| | | |
|---|---|------|
| Partnership working | Identify potential opportunities for closer partnership working, including more collaboration at a targeted local level to maximise the impact of existing resources. | 5.9 |
| Partnership working between highways and planning officers | Ensure that opportunities to secure funding for road safety interventions through the planning system are maximised, and that the detail of schemes is informed by community knowledge of locations of risk and/or dangerous behaviour. | 5.49 |
| Community structures to tackle dangerous driver behaviour | Consider ways in which multiple agencies can work more closely with communities to identify concerns about road safety – with a view to improving local intelligence, providing evidence of emerging risks and delivering targeted interventions that address dangerous behaviours – potentially using a model similar to that used to address Anti-Social Behaviour. | 5.51 |
| Language | Ensure that the language used to frame debate and communicate policy reflects cause of collisions and the centrality of the impact of road death and injury on victims. | 5.52 |
| Amplifying the voice of victims in education | Explore education materials that amplify the consequences of road death through the experiences of victims and their representatives | 5.68 |
| Extend education programmes to include further education institutions | Identify ways to engage with more young people who may have recently become new drivers, specifically including further education institutions. | 5.69 |
| Communication | Explore opportunities to promote more road safety messages on digital signage (Variable Messaging Signs) across the Leeds' road network. | 5.70 |
| Provision of KSI information on Data Mill North | Ensure accurate and updated information about KSI figures is published on Data Mill North, and to provide clear signposting to this data. | 5.72 |



Part One

4. Inquiry Approach

- 4.1 In recent years, the Infrastructure, Investment and Inclusive Growth Scrutiny Board has explored the challenges of improving local road safety on an annual basis, often alongside partners such as West Yorkshire Police.
- 4.2 Such discussions have been informed by performance data detailing the number of people killed or seriously injured in road traffic collisions. Areas of particular concern have included risks for vulnerable road users and a perception that KSI data suggests a disproportionate impact on young people.
- 4.3 Board members recommended in 2020 that road safety should be an area for a more detailed inquiry by the Board. However, in light of the covid-19 pandemic the inquiry was deferred until 2021/22.
- 4.4 The experience of the restrictions that formed part of the pandemic response provided a new context for the Board's inquiry. Between January - December 2020 Leeds recorded its lowest ever annual KSI figure (231) and there was a 47% reduction in KSI figures for April and May 2020, as compared to the same period in 2019. During this period in 2020 the country was experiencing its first full pandemic-related 'lockdown' involving wide-ranging restrictions on travel. The figures for this period expose in stark terms the direct correlation between reduced traffic volumes and the number of those killed or seriously injured in road traffic collisions.
-
- "Everyone has a part to play in changing dangerous behaviours and making our roads safer."*
-
- 4.5 In this period the Leeds Safer Roads Partnership (LSRP) formally set out an ambition to make sure that, no later than 2040, no one will be killed or seriously injured on the roads in Leeds: a 'Vision Zero' approach to casualty prevention.
- 4.6 The Board was keen to explore this ambition in further detail and to understand how partners can together achieve that ambition, despite the context of an anticipated increase in traffic volumes as the city emerges from pandemic-restrictions.
- 4.7 The initial inquiry was structured across two meeting in Autumn 2021 as per the detail below.



Part One

Inquiry Structure

Stage One

- Exploring what is meant by a Vision Zero approach to road safety.
- Understanding trends through KSI data from the last 5 years
- KSI Clusters and interventions delivered through the Casualty Reduction Programme.
- West Yorkshire Casualty Prevention Partnership
- Proposed re-assessment of criteria used to determine the deployment of static, mobile and average speed cameras.
- Enforcement options available to tackle dangerous behaviours.

Stage Two

- Local road safety campaigners' views and experiences
- School Streets initiative
- Active Neighbourhoods
- Roll out of 20mph zones
- Influencing Travel Behaviour Team



Part One

Contributors to the Inquiry

Partners

Chief Superintendent Edward Chesters – West Yorkshire Police

Inspector Chief Inspector Andrew Loftus – West Yorkshire Police

Inspector Nick Berry – West Yorkshire Police

Paul Jeffrey – Partnership & Innovation Manager, Casualty Prevention Bureau

Ian Greenwood – Road Safety Campaigner

Paula Knights – Road Safety Campaigner

Jill Walshaw – Road Safety Campaigner

John Scruby – Support and Care After Death (SCARD)

David Smith – Victim & Witness Support (WYCA)

Leeds City Council

Gary Bartlett – Chief Officer, Highways & Transportation

Lynsey McGarvey – Principal Transport Planner

Gillian McLeod – Transport Development Service Manager

Nicholas Hunt – Traffic Engineering Manager

Vicky Franks – Safer & Sustainable Travel Team



Part Two

5. Examining The Evidence

Vision Zero

- 5.1 The Scrutiny Board explored the Vision Zero approach to casualty prevention and welcomed the proposed adoption of this 'Safe System' approach in Leeds. The Board endorsed proposals to move away from traditional, and often reactive, road safety strategy to a more integrated approach based on shared responsibility.
- 5.2 The Board unanimously welcomed the introduction of an approach premised on the fact that all road deaths and serious injuries are preventable. This view was echoed by road safety campaigners who underlined the devastating impact of collisions on victims and the urgency of preventing the ongoing tragedy of multiple fatalities on our roads.
- 5.3 Stakeholders outlined the practical implications of Vision Zero's Safe System approach. It was acknowledged that people will still make mistakes on the road. However, taking a holistic view of road systems will reduce the likelihood of mistakes occurring and, where there are collisions, the expectation is that people will not be killed or seriously injured.
- 5.4 A recurring theme throughout the Board's deliberations was an acknowledgement of the complex number of causes of road collisions and the wide range of stakeholders that need to be part of the solution. Alongside those responsible for planning and highways engineering, enforcement agencies, policy makers and educators, the Board considered the role of vehicle manufacturers and the wider role citizens have in encouraging long-term behaviour change.
- 5.5 Given the extensive range of potential stakeholders, it is the view of the Board that there must be clear political leadership in Leeds and across West Yorkshire to ensure ownership and accountability for the Vision Zero agenda.
- 5.6 Establishing such visible political leadership would also address the concerns expressed by campaigners about a perceived lack of public accountability for the overall casualty prevention agenda.
- 5.7 The Board endorsed a proposal to establish a politically led Vision Zero Board through WYCA. They further recommended that the co-option onto the Board of representatives of those directly affected by road death and injury would strengthen the focus on victims.
- 5.8 The Scrutiny Board's deliberations highlighted at various instances that finite resources would always require decisions from all partners about what activity or road safety interventions are prioritised. It was acknowledged, for example, that it would not be possible to install traffic calming measures across all the new 20mph areas in the city.



Part Two

Instead, the principle of shared responsibility set out within Vision Zero would require identification of how behaviour change can be encouraged to prevent the human causes of many collisions.

- 5.9 The Board also heard that the targeting and impact of every 'road safety pound' could be maximised through closer localised working across partner organisations. This could involve joint decision-making and joint resource allocation. Members were reminded that the delivery of data led road safety initiatives continues to show high value for money, providing a range of indirect health and wellbeing benefits alongside road casualty prevention.
- 5.10 Members discussed the way in which resources can influence infrastructure design. They expressed concern that the varied sources of funding for individual infrastructure projects could predetermine how far 'road safety' features were included in a design. Rather than categorise projects as specifically 'road safety' works the Board suggested Government should require explicit reference to road safety criteria in all infrastructure projects.
- 5.11 Members agreed that if road safety had a higher national profile there would be an increased likelihood of such considerations being regarded as 'cross cutting' all policy areas. The Board therefore supported the view of police colleagues who advocated road policing having a comparable status in policing requirements as other major threats.

Policy and Legislation

- 5.12 The Board considered the statutory legislation that currently provides a framework for road safety activity and interventions including the Road Traffic Act 1988. It was noted that this is supplemented by local policies including the Best Council Plan.
- 5.13 Historically the Board has considered KSI data as part of its ongoing performance monitoring responsibilities. As the Council transitions from the Best Council Plan to the Best City Ambition the Board is keen to ensure that any new set of performance indicators should enable the ongoing monitoring of KSI data.
- 5.14 The Board supported the Executive Board's approval of the Leeds Safer Roads Vision Zero 2040 Strategy in February 2022, and its adoption in Summer 2022 following a period of consultation. It was noted that this approach had been established through the Executive Board's approval of the Leeds Transport Strategy in October 2021.



Part Two

- 5.15 The Scrutiny Board concluded that the successful adoption of the Vision Zero approach would also deliver outcomes that would contribute to the three corporate ‘pillars’ of inclusive growth, health and well-being and climate change.
- 5.16 West Yorkshire Police representatives confirmed their commitment to Vision Zero as set out in a refreshed West Yorkshire Police Safer Roads Strategic Plan. The Board explored the key ‘threats’ identified in that strategy: vulnerable road users, drug/drink driving, failure to wear a seatbelt, illegal or inappropriate speeding and the illegal use of mobile phones or other devices that cause distraction.
- 5.17 At a regional level, the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner became part of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority in May 2021. As such the Mayor is now responsible for setting a Police and Crime Plan. The Board noted the reported commitment by the West Yorkshire Mayor and the Deputy Mayor to road safety.

Reporting Casualty Data: CRASH

- 5.18 The Board received an overview of the 2021 change to the way West Yorkshire Police record road traffic collisions. The system now being used – Collision Reporting and Sharing System (CRASH) – automatically assigns a severity of classification to each casualty according to the injuries recorded by the reporting officer.
- 5.19 It is anticipated that the new system will see a significant increase in the proportion of reported casualties classified as ‘serious.’
- 5.20 Representatives from West Yorkshire Police acknowledged that, like any new system, there will be ‘teething problems’ with CRASH. However, the system was described as an improvement in the way KSI data is analysed across the county. The view of police representatives was that the system is a more effective intelligence product with a strong focus on demographics that will help focus prevention and enforcement activity.
- 5.21 Members discussed KSI figures for the last five years and the revised datasets that have been - and will be - published to enable more accurate historic comparisons following the introduction of the new reporting system. The adjusted data for Leeds 2016-19 resulted in a 43% increase in the number of serious casualties recorded.
- 5.22 In examining KSI data members highlighted the disproportionate number of young victims reflected in the statistics and the clear correlation between reduced traffic levels and the number of people killed or injured on the road during the pandemic.



Part Two

5.23 The Scrutiny Board explored the impact of perceptions of road safety on the willingness of citizens to pursue active travel alternatives and highlighted the potential benefits for health and well-being if citizens had greater confidence to walk or cycle.

Enforcement

- 5.24 Members discussed the links between some aspects of road safety and wider criminality, including the use of 'grey vehicles' by criminal networks. The importance of joining up community and criminal intelligence to inform resource allocation was debated, along with the need to have a variety of tools at the disposal of enforcement officers to tackle such behaviours.
- 5.25 It was noted that the use of some enforcement tactics can be polarising for the public – including fixed and mobile speed cameras. In West Yorkshire there is a view that the strict used of clear set of criteria in relation to siting cameras has helped maintain greater public confidence in the justification of their use.
- 5.26 In 2020 West Yorkshire police brought about 192,000 prosecutions for speed and red-light violations on urban and strategic networks, which is second only to the Metropolitan Police. There are 19 high risk mobile sites in Leeds and 118 static sites.
- 5.27 The Scrutiny Board heard evidence form the Casualty Prevention Partnership about the criteria, contained with the Department for Transport circular 1/2007, used to determine the site of fixed and mobile speed cameras in Leeds.
- 5.28 Members expressed concern about the retention of current 'high risk' criteria which were introduced by the Department for Transport during the original national safety camera pilot. Board members highlighted community concerns that the current system of siting cameras requires a tragedy to have occurred before action can be taken to address dangers that are often well known by local people.
- 5.29 Members advocated the adoption a broader set of criteria that could enable a proactive, preventative approach to installing cameras in sites identified as posing an emerging risk.
- 5.30 The Board was informed that the Casualty Prevention Partnership is also supportive of revised criteria being introduced to increase flexibility around the installation of cameras. Feedback to that effect has been provided to the Department for Transport.
- 5.31 Members welcomed the input of the Casualty Prevention Partnership to the Department for Transport's review of circular 1/2007. However, in addition to the contribution of regional technical experts, it was the opinion of the Board that local politicians should also be involved in the consultation process to reflect the views of their communities.



Part Two

- 5.32 The cost of installing, maintaining and processing offences that are generated from speed cameras was examined. It was noted that Casualty Prevention Partnership is cost effective in comparison to other localities and has increased the number of offences it processes. However, there remains a requirement for speed cameras to be self-funding.
- 5.33 The Board confirmed its support for partners exploring the use of average speed cameras along some lengths of road in Leeds. While there is a risk of displacing traffic, the evidence also suggests they could be a strong technical asset, discouraging “camera surfing” (drivers speeding up between cameras) while reducing congestion and street furniture.
- 5.34 The Scrutiny Board explored activity that falls within the Leeds District Neighbourhood Policing Team’s ‘Operation Amberland.’ This road safety initiative targets roads highlighted as a concern by local communities through web reporting, Operation SNAP (downloading of dashcam footage) or community meetings.
- 5.35 Particular areas of interest for the Board included the use of Speed Indicator Devices, pro-laser devices and tackling poor parking.
- 5.36 The visibility of community-based activity was welcomed by members as deterring dangerous behaviour, reducing risk at community-identified locations and also improving community perceptions of road safety.
- 5.37 Members queried, however, how data was collected from SIDs and how that could be better used to determine where, when and how intervention is directed.
- 5.38 WYP representatives reiterated that any community-led activity should be risk assessed and appropriate to the locations in question. It was noted that here had been instances of members of the public becoming aggressive in response to speed deterrents, particularly in some urban locations.
- 5.39 The challenges for all stakeholders of resourcing some of these community exercises, including providing training to officers to support communities, was explored. West Yorkshire Police described “hard decisions” being required to determine where resources are directed.
- 5.40 Current frustration with legislation in relation to the misuse of handheld devices was outlined. The Board was informed that current requirements for the police to demonstrate a smartphone has been used for “interactive telecommunications” limit the success of enforcement where a driver has a device in their hand at the wheel.



Part Two

- 5.41 This had also caused public frustration as evidence provided via Operation SNAP of drivers using devices at the wheel is not enough in itself to result in the six penalty points that could be issued if a driver was proved to be sending a text message or making a phone call.
- 5.42 The Board agreed that a recommendation of the inquiry should reflect the need for legislation to be updated given the extent to which technology has developed since the original text was drafted.
- 5.43 It was further recommended that manufacturers and re-sellers should be required to demonstrate to consumers how a smartphone can be set up to only allow handsfree calls while driving.
- 5.44 The urgency of encouraging wider behaviour change in society was highlighted by the fact that technology does already exist to tackle some of the causes of collisions through “in car enforcement.”
- 5.45 The use of speed limiting technology could be introduced immediately in many vehicles but require public acceptance that personal freedom to exceed regulations would be automatically curtailed to prevent road deaths and injury.

Community Engagement

- 5.46 The Board considered the concept of shared responsibility, as set out in the Vision Zero approach, in relation to prevention and enforcement activity in local communities. Members explored a perception from communities that speeding restrictions, for example, are “often not enforced” and a fear of dangerous behaviour involving quad bikes and two wheeled vehicles.
- 5.47 However, it was also acknowledged that in instances where resources allowed enforcement to take place this in itself was addressing the symptom of such behaviour rather than the cause.
- 5.48 All partners advocated listening much more closely to communities about their concerns. It was agreed communities can provide valuable information about locations considered to be high risk or where intervention is needed to tackle patterns of dangerous behaviour. It was proposed that Community Committees could play an important part in identifying some of the locations of concern in their respective areas.
- 5.49 The Board also considered the way in which community knowledge of behaviour and risk could inform the detail of new planning applications. It was suggested that community



Part Two

intelligence could strengthen the work of highways and planning officers, as they seek to secure funding through the planning process for works to alleviate the anticipated adverse impact of development on local transport networks.

- 5.50 A successful preventative approach to road safety at a local level would rely upon a greater sense of shared responsibility from all stakeholders. The Board agreed that part of the solution would be improved communication between local organisations, public service providers, members of the public, businesses and enforcement agencies.
- 5.51 Members reflected upon the successful multi-agency approach to tackling anti-social behaviour and recommended that a similar approach be explored in relation to road safety concerns within communities.

Language

- 5.52 One of the most prominent messages from road safety campaigners represented at the meeting was that the language used to discuss road safety is extremely important to victims.
- 5.53 The Board endorsed a recommendation that the adoption of a new approach to casualty prevention should involve a move away from traditional terminology that has sometimes reinforced a sense that there is a degree of inevitability in the case of some collisions.
- 5.54 Examples discussed included “casualty reduction targets,” which inadvertently implies an acceptable level of road death or injury. Equally, the use of “accident” was highlighted as obscuring the cause of collisions – all of which are deemed preventable under a Vision Zero approach.
- 5.55 Reference to victims is often absent from traditional policy documents about road safety and the Board agreed they should be explicitly central to any strategy relating to road safety.
- 5.56 The low-profile of victims within the national road safety debate was further illustrated by the poverty of resources allocated to support those dealing with the consequences of road traffic collisions.
- 5.57 The Board was updated on lobbying that successfully prevented the withdrawal of a grant for victims by the Ministry of Justice. Under the Department for Transport this funding has since been retained but remains – in the words of one attendee – “scandalously low.” Nationally it was argued victims should also be central to the resourcing debate that runs alongside decision making about road safety.



Part Two

Engineering

- 5.58 New ways of evaluating sites where road safety issues have been identified were discussed. It was noted that the new evaluation process aims to better assess the underlying causes of road casualties and to identify the most appropriate intervention.
- 5.59 The evaluation analyses injury collisions and assesses the deliverability and value for money of preventing road casualties through physical intervention.
- 5.60 Members welcomed the accelerated roll out of 20mph speed limits across the city and the benefits communities have seen in terms of increased road safety and active travel. The principle of school streets was also welcomed and, while members recognised some localised challenges, the outcome of the evaluation of the use of temporary traffic orders to restrict traffic movement around schools at the start and end of the school day was anticipated with interest.

Annual Pedestrian Crossing Review & School Crossing patrols

- 5.61 Members of the Board welcomed the introduction of technology at traffic-controlled crossings that is more responsive to pedestrian demand. It was agreed this is in line with wider aspirations for increased active travel and improved health and well-being.
- 5.62 An improved perception of safety was regarded as a significant factor in increasing public confidence to cycle and walk, particularly for children.
- 5.63 Likewise, members queried whether further work could take place with Civic Enterprise Leeds in instances where a school does not meet the criteria for a school crossing patrol.

Education, Engagement and Communication

- 5.64 The Board welcomed a review of the education provision for children and young people in relation to road safety and noted the influence young people can have on their wider families in terms of behavioural change.
- 5.65 Concern was expressed about low take up of road safety training in schools in some areas of the city and all stakeholders reiterated the importance of starting this work from a young age.
- 5.66 The importance of using age-appropriate language and messaging was discussed, particularly with regard to successfully targeting teenagers as they begin to drive. One



Part Two

campaigner talked about asking young people to “take just five minutes” to consider whether they get in a car as a driver or passenger, and what the consequences of doing so might be.

- 5.67 Campaigners underlined the danger in giving young people rapid access to what are increasingly powerful vehicles without ongoing education, monitoring and skills-based support.
- 5.68 The Board reflected on the profound impact of hearing from victims and their families about the experience and consequences of road traffic collisions. Members recommended that officers consider how such experiences could be more effectively emphasised within programmes of education, engagement and communication.
- 5.69 Council officers were further asked to consider how they could extend the programme of education to specifically reach more young people who may be new to driving – for example, by engaging further education institutions.
- 5.70 The Board considered other ways to target road safety messages at drivers. It was suggested that existing resources such as Variable Message Signs on the Leeds road network could be better used to promote road safety messages around the ‘five threats’ identified by WYP. The Board was informed that VMS Boards are being updated, which should offer greater flexibility in future.
- 5.71 The benefits of supplementing education with additional training, such as advanced driving courses, and support for new drivers was debated. The Board considered the merits of graduated licences and were supportive in principle of new drivers gaining experience of the roads over a set period of time to develop their skills and knowledge.
- 5.72 The Board was supportive of lobbying government to reconsider the introduction of graduated licences in the UK, as has been the case in several other countries including Ireland, Australia and New Zealand.
- 5.73 The Board debated whether an equivalent to the speed awareness course could be introduced for other offences to help educate people about the potential impact of their behaviour.

Public Accountability & Transparency

- 5.74 Earlier sections of this report touch upon the importance of clear and accountable political leadership on road safety. With the pandemic providing an opportunity for a fresh approach, the Board was urged to ensure there is clear leadership amongst decision



Part Two

makers so that existing data and evidence can be acted upon, the impact of resources maximised and examples of best practice effectively shared.

- 5.75 There was no doubt amongst stakeholders that at a localised level within individual communities road safety is often identified as a high priority. However, it was put to the Board that it is also difficult for citizens to understand how multiple layers of legislation and strategy across different partner organisations translate into activity on road safety.
- 5.76 Following the introduction of a West Yorkshire Mayor, it is hoped there will also be a more obvious public focal point for this agenda at a regional level. However, members were keen to explore how road safety might achieve greater traction in national public debate. Members questioned whether explicitly presenting road safety as primarily a public health issue would be one way of achieving that aim.
- 5.77 Campaigners reiterated the need for transparent data and publicly available timescales, so as to allow citizens to understand the performance of local and regional partners in progressing Vision Zero. It was therefore recommended that local data should be published and updated on Data Mill North, with members of the public signposted to this site as required.
- 5.78 For their part the Scrutiny Board agreed future monitoring of performance in relation to Vision Zero should be built into ongoing work programming, so as to enable members to understand progress, challenges and opportunities within this agenda.

Scrutiny Board (Infrastructure, Investment & Inclusive Growth)
Preventing Road Deaths and Injuries on Leeds Roads
January 2021

Report author: Rebecca Atherton

