

Appendix C – Technical note for Workstream A5

Technical Note Note

Project Title:	Child Road Safety and Poverty Research
MVA Project Number:	C3A25400
Subject:	Workstream A5 Review of Road Safety Strategy for Northern Ireland 2010 – 20
Note Number:	Final Version
Author(s):	Stephen Wood
Reviewer(s):	Carry Stephenson
Last updated:	13 June 2011

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This workstream (A5) involves preliminary discussions with key stakeholders who are responsible for the delivery of measures, identified in the Road Safety Strategy for Northern Ireland 2010 – 20, which are of potential interest to this research. It is essentially a scoping task and is not intended to collate and document detailed information – more detailed information about specific measures (including information relating to cost) will be collected in future workstreams.
- 1.2 Section 2 presents a list of actions drawn from the Road Safety Strategy for Northern Ireland 2010 - 20 which have been identified as being of potential interest to the research. Initial discussions were held with four stakeholders, identified in Section 2, in order to confirm for each measure:
- whether it is an existing or proposed new measure;
 - specific policies or rules that apply to the implementation of the measure;
 - whether it is suitable for phased or targeted implementation in areas of deprivation;
 - its applicability to particular groups relevant to the research;
 - any evaluation evidence regarding effectiveness or value for money;
 - general issues relating to resourcing; and
 - any other issues considered to be of value to the research.
- 1.3 Section 3 sets out the responses received in tabular format.
- 1.4 Section 4 provides additional detailed discussion on key issues. These discussions include information collected from additional stakeholders who were identified during this stage of the research.

2 List of Actions

2.1 The List of Actions has been grouped by executive stakeholders who have some responsibility for their delivery. These are:

- DRD Roads Service;
- DOE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division;
- DoE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division and Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) jointly; and
- DoE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division and Department of Education jointly.

2.1.1 Actions falling within the remit of these stakeholders are provided below.

DRD Roads Service (Greg McClelland)

- Grouping: Safer Roads - Pedestrians
 - 37 - Puffin crossings
 - 38 - Zebra crossing
 - 39 - Countdown timers
- Grouping Safer Roads – Cyclists
 - 40 - cycle lanes and 20mph zones
 - 41 – cycle infrastructure

DOE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division (Desi McDonnell)

- Grouping Safer Road Users – Walking and Cycling
 - 107 – Active Travel Forum
 - 108 – Public Information for pedestrian safety including deaf
 - 109 – Public Information for pedestrian safety – reflective clothing
 - 110 – Public Information for pedestrian safety - alcohol
 - 111 – Public Information for pedestrian safety - rural
 - 112 – Monitor and research
- Grouping Safer Road Users – Working with Others
 - 114 – new partnerships with sporting associations
 - 115 – local road safety pilot schemes
 - 117 – local authorities to build capacity
 - 118 – build wider range of stakeholders

- 119 – understanding and co-ordination of roles
- Grouping Safer Road Users – Educate and Inform
 - 129 – safety campaigns focused on most serious casualties
 - 130 – campaign focused on wider road user responsibility
 - 133 – education for those in areas of deprivation
- Grouping Safer Road Users – Information
 - 146 - quality of data, e.g. rurality, deprivation and journey purpose
 - 148 – learn from research including NI Deprivation Research
 - 149 – creation of research programme
- Grouping Safer Road User Groups – Pedestrians
 - 174 – visibility travelling to and from school

DOE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division (Desi McDonnell) and PSNI (David Brady)

- Grouping Safer Vehicles
 - 60 – powers to seize vehicles from serious or persistent road traffic offenders (on the basis of the linkage to crime levels)
- Grouping Safer Road Users – Penalties and Enforcement
 - 67 – enhancement of PSNI enforcement of safety related traffic offences
 - 76 – campaigns and enforcement of seatbelt wearing
 - 81 – public to report areas of regular speeding

DOE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division (Desi McDonnell) and Department of Education (John Kennedy)

- Grouping Safer Road User Groups – Children and Young People
 - 153 – cycle training
 - 156 – children participation in campaigns
 - 159 – school baseline survey
 - 160 – schools road safety resources
 - 161 – school curriculum
 - 162 – engagement with others
 - 163 – school uniforms

3 Stakeholders' Responses

- 3.1 Responses obtained from Roads Service, to the questions posed in Section 1.1 are presented in Table 3.1.
- 3.2 Responses from DOE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division are presented in Table 3.2.
- 3.3 Responses from DOE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division and PSNI are presented in Table 3.3.
- 3.4 Responses from DOE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division and the Department of Education are presented in Table 3.4.

Table 3.1 Responses from DRD Roads Service

Action No	Action Description	Existing or proposed new measure	Specific policies or rules apply	Suitable for phased or targeted	Applicability to particular groups	Evaluation evidence re VFM	Costs and resourcing	Other Comments relevant to Research
37	Puffin Crossings	New measure. None yet implemented.	Yes, DfT and Roads Service guidance.	Yes, potentially.	May be particularly appropriate to research groups where exclusive right-of-way needed.	See 1	See 2	1. Cost benefit analysis may be derived from observed numbers of pedestrians and vehicles using the crossing. 2. Capital costs approximately £20k per site but additional awareness training will be required.
38	Zebra Crossings	Existing, but internally illuminated zebra poles are quite new.	Yes, DfT and Roads Service guidance.	Yes, potentially.	Care needed as no exclusive right-of-way.	See 1	Relatively cheap as no complex technology.	Perhaps not well suited to young children. 1. Cost benefit analysis may be derived from observed numbers of pedestrians and vehicles using the crossing.
39	Countdown Timers	New, to be trialed.	Yes, but not yet developed.	Not particularly. More suited to high volume pedestrian crossing locations.	Not particularly. More suited to high volume pedestrian crossing locations.	See 1	See 2	1. Cost benefit analysis may be derived from observed numbers of pedestrians and vehicles using the crossing. 2. Capital costs approximately £25k per site but additional awareness training will be required.
40	Cycle lanes and 20mph zones	New, to be linked with Speed Management Policy	Yes, DfT and Roads Service guidance.	Yes, if heavy cycle use.	20mph zones well suited to areas with young children	See 1	See 2	1. VFM related principally to quality of environment / life impacts. 2. Capital costs vary according to complexity of application.
41	Cycle Infrastructure	New and ongoing measure	Yes, DfT and Roads Service guidance and agreements with local authorities regarding sweeping.	Not particularly. More suited to high volume cycle flows for utility purposes, i.e. commuting.	Not particularly. More suited to high volume cycle flows for utility purposes, i.e. commuting.	See 1	See 2	1. Can return high benefit cost ratios where well used and no delays incurred on traffic streams. 2. Capital costs vary according to complexity of application.

Table 3.2 Responses from DoE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division

Action No	Action Description	Existing or proposed new measure	Specific policies or rules apply	Suitable for phased or targeted	Applicability to particular groups	Evaluation evidence re VFM	Costs and resourcing	Other Comments relevant to Research
123	We will set up an Active Travel Forum, including a range of stakeholders, which will consider a broad strategic approach to, and the promotion of, active travel.	Proposed	None	No, but can target activities	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Cyclists/Pedestrians/public transport users 2. Delivering a more sustainable Northern Ireland will maximise the investment in roads and other infrastructure and enhance Northern Ireland as an attractive location for inward investment. Reduced transport, car parking and travel costs should result from ATF recommendations. 3. Overhead costs only as the Travel Forum is advisory. DOE, DHSS&PS, DE, DSD, DETI, NIO, Local Government, Voluntary and Business Sectors are represented.
125	We will consider producing new public information campaigns addressing pedestrian safety taking into account the needs of people with disabilities.	Proposed	None	Yes	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Pedestrians and those with a disability 2. Reduction in pedestrian casualties, particularly those with disabilities 3. Campaigns funded by Roads Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division (RSVRD) - costs not known and depends on the nature of campaigns and available resources
126	We will consider producing a new public information campaign about the responsibilities of and risks associated with being a pedestrian and what they and other road users can do to improve pedestrian safety.	Proposed	None	Yes	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. pedestrians /other road users 2. Reduction in pedestrian casualties 3. Campaigns funded by RSVRD - costs not known and depends on the nature of campaigns and available resources
127	We will consider producing a new public information campaign to educate pedestrians on the dangers of walking whilst impaired through alcohol or drugs.	Proposed	None	Yes	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Pedestrians 2. Reduction in pedestrian casualties 3. Campaigns funded by RSVRD - costs not known and depends on the nature of campaigns and available resources
129	We will consider producing a new public information campaign highlighting the dangers associated with being a pedestrian on rural roads.	Proposed	None	Yes	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Pedestrians in rural areas 2. Reduction in pedestrian casualties in rural areas 3. Campaigns funded by RSVRD - costs not known and depends on the nature of campaigns and available resources
131	We will continue to monitor and, where appropriate, carry out NI specific research, on pedestrian and cyclist behaviour with a view to developing further effective policy interventions.	Proposed	None	Can be phased as req'd	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Pedestrians and cyclists 2. Reduction in pedestrian and cyclist casualties, provided research outcomes are implemented 3. Research funded by RSVRD - costs not known
135	We will continue to seek opportunities to forge new partnerships with sporting associations in order to promote /assure road safety. For example, we will consider how such groups could work with us to deliver road safety messages.	Existing	None	No	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. May target particular road user groups e.g. Young People - Young Farmers, GAA etc 2. Increase in opportunities to spread the road safety message to high risk groups which may lead to a reduction in casualties 3. No hard costs anticipated
136	We will consider how we might better conduct local road safety pilot initiatives working with voluntary, community and other stakeholders.	Proposed	None	Can be phased as req'd	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. May target particular road user groups depending on issue e.g. young people, older people, disabled groups etc 2. Reduction in casualties 3. Costs not known
138	We will work with local authorities, to explore ways to build capacity to reduce casualties at local level, identify local road safety issues and objectives and determine how we can work together to address local needs and priorities.	Proposed	LAs need to introduce legislation?	Can be phased as req'd	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. May target particular road user groups depending local need 2. Reduction in casualties in local areas 3. Costs not known
139	We will work towards the inclusion of a wider range of stakeholders in monitoring and evaluating road safety in NI and advising Ministers.	Proposed	None	No	No	See 1	See 2	1. Greater co-operation and effectiveness between stakeholders 2. No hard costs anticipated

Technical Note Note Final Version

140	We will seek better understanding and co-ordination of road safety roles and initiatives among those agencies involved to minimise potential duplication or overlap.	Proposed	MOUs?	No	No	See 1	See 2	1. Greater co-ordination and effectiveness between those involved in road safety 2. No hard costs involved
144	We will undertake a review of road safety education services and resources to ensure that they appropriately address today's road safety issues.	Proposed	None	No	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Review outcomes may target particular high risk groups e.g. children, young people, older people etc 2. reduction in casualties in high risk groups 3. Review cost approx. £50k
151	We will continue to improve road user behaviour through our road safety campaigns. We will focus on behaviours that have a clear link to the most serious casualties.	Existing	None	Yes	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. May target particular high risk groups 2. Reduction in casualties involving high risk behaviours 3. Campaigns funded by RSVRD - costs not known
176	We will review the findings of the DEL scoping study into issues relating to young people aged 16-24 who are not in employment, education or training. We will consider any lessons learnt which may help improve road safety for this group and inform appropriate educational opportunities, with particular focus on areas of deprivation.	Proposed	None	Possible	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Young people aged 16-24 2. Better engagement with this group may lead to casualty reduction 3. No hard costs involved
171	We will improve the quality of our data. We will also seek to expand and supplement existing data sources in order to help target interventions more effectively and develop our understanding of road safety problems and trends, particularly focusing on rurality, deprivation and purpose of journey. To facilitate this, the road safety partners will, where appropriate, adopt a data-sharing approach.	Proposed	None	Can be phased as req'd	No	See 1	See 2	1. Better understanding of issues and problems may lead to better interventions and eventual casualty reductions 2. Costs not known
173	We will consider, learn from and, where appropriate, implement any relevant recommendations from ongoing road safety research projects including: Deprivation and child pedestrian casualties; Motorcycle casualties in NI; Benchmarking	Proposed	None	Can be phased as req'd	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Deprivation work investigating child pedestrians 2. Casualty reduction provided that outcomes are implemented successfully 3. Costs not known
174	We will consider the creation of a comprehensive Road Safety research programme.	Proposed	None	No	No	See 1	See 2	1. Better understanding of issues and problems through research projects may lead to better interventions and eventual casualty reductions 2. No hard costs involved
199	We will investigate ways to improve the visibility of pedestrians particularly children travelling to and from school.	Proposed	None	No	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Focuses on child pedestrians 2. Reduction in child pedestrian casualties 3. Costs not known

Table 3.3 Responses from DoE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division and PSNI

Action No	Action Description	Existing or proposed new measure	Specific policies or rules apply	Suitable for phased or targeted	Applicability to particular groups	Evaluation evidence re VFM	Costs and resourcing	Other Comments relevant to Research
66	We will consider taking powers to seize vehicles from serious or persistent road traffic offenders.	Proposed	New legislation required.	No	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. May impact disproportionately on young people 2. Casualty reduction 3. Costs not known
67	Continue to enhance the effectiveness of PSNI enforcement through the use of intelligence led policing strategies and technologies in line with the National Intelligence Model. This will lead to more targeted resources and enforcement aimed at reducing the numbers of people killed or seriously injured with particular reference to: high risk locations; high risk behaviours; high risk groups; continue cross border enforcement.	Proposed	In line with National Intelligence Model	Can be phased or targeted as req'd	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Will apply to high risk groups e.g. young people, rural casualties etc 2. Casualty reduction 3. costs not known
84	Continue to carry out campaigns and enforcement and consider introducing retraining courses on seat belt use to further improve compliance rates.	Proposed	None	Can be phased or targeted as req'd	No	See 1	See 2	1. Casualty reduction 2. Campaigns funded by RSVRD - costs not known
89	We will continue to encourage the public to report areas where speeding regularly occurs.	Proposed	None	No	No	See 1	See 2	1. Casualty reduction 2. costs not known

Table 3.4 Responses from DoE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division and Department of Education

Action No	Action Description	Existing or proposed new measure	Specific policies or rules apply	Suitable for phased or targeted	Applicability to particular groups	Evaluation evidence re VFM	Costs and resourcing	Other Comments relevant to Research
179	We will work with partners to assess the value of introducing an additional cycle training element to Northern Ireland.	Proposed	None	Possible	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Cycle training focuses on primary school children 2. Safer road users - leading to casualty reduction? 3. Costs not known
182	We will encourage greater participation in road safety messages from children and seek to include more of their ideas in campaigns.	Proposed	None	Yes	See 1	See 2	See 2	1. Children 2. engagement provides opportunity to spread road safety message, which may lead to casualty reduction 3. costs not known
185	We will conduct a baseline survey, via questionnaire, of the issues facing schools and youth services in relation to road safety education. DE to give due consideration to the findings and consider whether to commission additional work from the Education and Training Inspectorate (ETI).	Proposed	None	No	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Survey will be sent to all primary and post primary schools in Northern Ireland 2. May lead to better road safety education for children, which may lead to casualty reduction 3. Costs not known
186	We will engage with DOE, ELBs and CCEA and the Education and Skills Authority (ESA) once it is established, to explore how resources for schools on road safety can better empower children to make informed safe choices and decisions.	Proposed	None	No	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Measure focuses on the provision of road safety resources for use by children in schools in NI 2. May lead to better road safety education resources for children, which may lead to casualty reduction 3. Costs not known
187	We will, through CCEA and ESA once it is established, inform schools clearly about existing opportunities within the curriculum to highlight road safety.	Proposed	None	No	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Measure focuses on the opportunities for children to take road safety subjects within the curriculum 2. May lead to better road safety education for children, which may lead to casualty reduction 3. Costs not known
188	We will issue guidance on school uniforms to highlight issues of visibility related to road safety.	Proposed	None	Yes	See 1	See 2	See 3	1. Measure focuses on schoolchildren 2. Pedestrian casualty reductions 3. Costs not known

4 Additional Discussion on Key Measures

- 4.1 This section provides detailed discussion on additional key issues. These discussions were held with stakeholders identified in the previous section, and additional stakeholders who were identified during this stage of the research.

Roads Service (RS)

- 4.2 Roads Service expressed the view that residential traffic calming was now relatively widespread within socially deprived housing areas. In addition, whilst there was a perception of danger close to schools, the collisions and casualties tended to happen beyond school hours. There may be greater exposure to risk in deprived areas due to low car ownership and therefore parents being less able to transport children in cars.

DOE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division (RSVRD)

- 4.3 RSVRD raised the issue of a review of the Roads Safety Education Officers Service currently being undertaken by the Department of Finance and Personnel. The subsequent discussion is covered separately below. RSVRD also raised the survey of roads safety education being undertaken by Department of Education. (Meeting to be held with DE on Thursday 10 March.)

Road Safety Education Officers (RSEO)

- 4.4 The aims and key responsibilities of the RSEO service is set out in its web page at:

<http://www.roadsafetyni.gov.uk/index/education/aboutus-education.htm>

- 4.5 In summary, the aims are to contribute to the NI Road Safety Strategy by:

- providing a road safety education and training programme for schools in accordance with the Department for Transport (Great Britain) Road Safety in Schools Good Practice Guidelines;
- delivering a resource-led approach to road safety education in schools in line with the Department for Transport's Road Safety Education in Schools Good Practice Guidelines;
- maintaining contact with schools through a programme of visits and providing training and support to teachers, as appropriate, with a view to having road safety taught on a regular structured basis; and
- taking advantage of PR opportunities throughout the year to promote the road safety message, the work of the RSEO Service and the Department.

- 4.6 In general the classroom calendars and resources were considered to be successful at primary school level, however there was considered to be an outstanding need to evaluate their effectiveness. In addition it was considered advantageous to incorporate road safety into the secondary school curriculum in the future and also for the RSEO service to operate with youth and community groups.

- 4.7 Key responsibilities particularly relevant to the research of deprived areas are:

- Deliver Practical Child Pedestrian Safety Training in 75 schools, mainly in socially disadvantaged areas.

4.8 Discussion around this issue suggested that there were some practical difficulties in ensuring that the focus was on schools in socially disadvantaged areas. Success on this issue required teachers to continue to provide the training in subsequent years – this was often not the case due to the competition with other subjects within the school curriculum and staff changes.

Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI)

4.9 There was discussion on the National Intelligence Model, mentioned under Action 67. It was explained that this is a process-driven model with District (data) Analysts at its core. There is continuous evidence-based analysis as to where PSNI resources should be focused to ensure greatest return.

4.10 Local police officers also contribute to presentations in schools and in youth groups. These may include personal safety and drug awareness in addition to road safety. However, it was thought that the current programmes involving the police may lack impact.

4.11 Attention regarding possible best practice was drawn to the project operated in Leicester, see link, <http://www.warningzone.org.uk/>. This is an interactive facility dealing with the range of safety issues facing children. Children make a day visit to the centre.

Department of Education (DE)

4.11.1 It was made clear that DE has no statutory responsibility for road safety education in schools. However, DE takes a voluntary role in liaising with DOE and its RSEO in keeping abreast of developments and where possible seeking synergy with standard school curricula.

4.11.2 DE explained that the responsibility for Actions 179 and 182 lay primarily with DOE Road Safety and Vehicle Regulation Division. Discussion was centred therefore on the Actions 185 – 188.

4.11.3 The baseline questionnaire (Action 185) is currently being finalised as an on-line survey and will be sent to all mainstream schools soon. A separate questionnaire will be prepared for youth services and run later. The school questionnaire is expected to identify:

- whether a policy exists regarding road safety education;
- if so who prepares it and how often is it reviewed;
- what resources are used and how effective are they; and
- what co-ordination is there with other authorities (i.e. across schools and education authorities).

4.11.4 There is currently no start date for the CCEA exploration of road safety resources (Action 186).

4.11.5 Schools have been informed on the opportunities to highlight road safety as part of the current curriculum by letter (Action 187).

4.11.6 Guidance has been sent to schools regarding visibility and school uniforms (Action 188). Subsequently a small number of schools are taking part in trials.

Department for Finance and Personnel – Business Consultancy Service

- 4.12 Discussion was centred on the current review of the RSEO service. This is focused on the effectiveness of the service and whether it is properly resourced and located to ensure synergy with other associated government programmes.