



**ROAD SAFETY**  
**AND**  
**SPEED MANAGEMENT**

**A STUDY LED BY THE MOTORISTS' FORUM**

**August 2005**

## **Contents**

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2: ROAD SAFETY AND SPEED IN THE UK TODAY – THE FACTS AND EVIDENCE</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3: SPEED. WHAT MOTORISTS AND OTHER ROAD USERS THINK ABOUT SPEED – AND ABOUT THE SPEED THEY WOULD LIKE TO DRIVE AT</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4: THE POLICY INSTRUMENTS</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5: THE ROAD SAFETY DEAL</b>	<b>13</b>
- Government	13
- Drivers	18
- Local Highway Authorities	20
- Enforcement Authorities	22
- Motor Industry	25
- Insurance Industry	27
- Motoring Organisations	28
- Employers	29
<b>CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Annex A – WITNESSES PROVIDING EVIDENCE</b>	<b>32</b>

This report has been prepared by the Motorists' Forum Road Safety Working Group. It has been endorsed by the whole Motorists' Forum and The Commission for Integrated Transport. The report has been sent to the Secretary of State for Transport, the Rt Hon Alistair Darling. Copies are available on the Motorists' Forum web site [www.cfit.gov.uk/mf](http://www.cfit.gov.uk/mf)

## **Executive Summary**

This study has been initiated by the Motorists' Forum in response to an invitation from the Commission for Integrated Transport for the Forum to help develop the Government's road safety strategy and a request by the Secretary of State for Transport to undertake a more detailed investigation of speed management.

Our report concludes that speed is a contributory factor in accidents and that the management of speed is an important element in any successful effort to reduce deaths and injuries on the roads. But to devise a strategy which is both effective and commands the support of the motoring public is not straightforward.

This report sets out our approach. It recognises that the interaction between the road, the vehicle and the driver is complex, and that effective action will involve many players. All of them need to commit to programmes of coordinated action in a whole range of areas including engineering, technology, training, communication, regulation and its enforcement. We have called this commitment to coordinated action 'The Deal'.

If this approach is accepted by the Government, it will need an action programme to take it forward. We suggest that the Government should bring together representatives of all the organisations involved. Each should be asked whether they are prepared to commit themselves to the proposals in the report; or, if not, to suggest other proposals which they think more effective or more practical. In either event, they should be asked to put forward the specific steps they would take in their areas.

This coordinated programme could then be monitored regularly. The Government could publish regular reports bringing together the statistics of road accidents, on speeding offences, on drivers' attitudes, on training and retraining, and on the various other measures recommended, including the results of the experiments and demonstration projects we recommend. We could then all see for ourselves whether we were making progress; what works; where more effort is required; and which policies might need rethinking.

Regular monitoring reports could then provide a focus for motoring organisations, road safety organisations and others to devise their own campaigns, targeting particular aspects of the problem, including driver behaviour and skills. Others, such as motor manufacturers and insurance companies could use these occasions to highlight new developments in their areas. We believe that if people, including drivers, can see that progress is being made in sensible and relevant ways towards the common objective, and to their advantage, they are more likely to play their part, and the result will be greater than that achievable by actions taken in isolation.

Our full recommendations are set out in the following report. The key issues we consider should be taken forward as quickly as possible include:

## **By Government**

- finalising the updated guidance to Traffic Authorities on setting local speed limits by the end of 2005 at the latest and monitoring and reviewing its implementation.
- stimulating innovation and experiment and disseminating best practice by demonstration projects and other means.
- providing increased resources for local authority road safety improvements.
- facilitating the establishment of a national e-database of speed limits, and generally facilitating the emergence of in-car information technology.

## **By Drivers**

- taking a pride in their driving.
- driving at an appropriate speed for road and traffic conditions.
- undertaking further training, or re-training, at appropriate times in a driving career.
- giving full attention to driving at all times and being considerate to other people on the road.

## **By Local Highway Authorities**

- ensuring our road systems are safe, intelligible and predictable.
- giving appropriate priority to investing in measures designed to improve road safety.
- ensuring speed limits are clearly signposted.
- reviewing the speed limits on all roads in the light of guidance in the new DfT Circular on the setting of local speed limits.

## **By Enforcement Authorities**

- implementing the police pledge in the Roads Policing Strategy to challenge the whole range of road police issues, including unlawful and unruly behaviour as well as speeding.
- signing speed limits on safety cameras and warning signs.
- involving Safety Camera Partnerships with the Road Safety Forum arrangements.
- offering the option of attending a speed awareness course, operated to national guidelines, to all first time offenders as an alternative to an automatic penalty.

## **By the Motor Industry**

- continuing to support the development of new in-car information technology systems and the development of devices for collision avoidance and damage minimisation.
- taking up of new technology opportunities by fleet operators and company fleets.
- introducing such technology into the vehicles of rental companies.

### **By the Insurance Industry**

- encouraging new technology developments designed to reduce collision risk by rewarding those who use such technology.
- continuing to offer incentives for motorists to undertake effective training courses and to drive safely.
- working with other interested parties to make insurance more affordable for young drivers and to reward those young drivers who undertake additional training.

### **By Motoring Organisations**

- committing to reinforcing road safety messages, particularly as regards the importance of driving at an appropriate speed.
- reinforcing the message that people should be fully trained and up to the task of driving under current circumstances.

### **By Employers**

- having a Health and Safety policy dealing with the risks of work-related driving in place.
- having a top-level commitment to work-related road safety in an organisation.
- having adequate systems in place for carrying out risk assessments and delivering training.
- monitoring performance to ensure that a work-related road safety policy is effective.

Members of the Forum have collectively agreed to work to take forward the recommendations that fall within their responsibility. We urge all others to do so as well. Together, we can make a difference and our roads a safer place for all users.

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 In 2003, the Motorists' Forum undertook a detailed assessment of the delivery of the Government's road safety strategy on behalf of the Commission for Integrated Transport (CfIT).
- 1.2 The Government committed to work with CfIT to develop the road safety strategy in its first three year review of the strategy - *Tomorrow's roads - safer for everyone*. CfIT subsequently invited the Motorists' Forum to carry out this piece of work and provide a further report to the Commission. Additionally, in April 2004, The Rt. Hon. Alistair Darling, the Secretary of State for Transport, requested the Forum to undertake a more detailed investigation of speed management.
- 1.3 In order to provide advice on this significant and high profile road safety issue, the Forum set up a Road Safety Working Group chaired by David Holmes, and consisting of the following experts:

David Holmes	Chairman
Inspector Gillian Davies	ACPO
Peter Davis	SMMT
Kevin Delaney	RAC Foundation
Professor Andrew Evans	Imperial College
Robert Gifford	PACTS
Brian Goodwin	County Surveyors Society
Andrew Howard	AA Motoring Trust

- 1.4 The Forum commissioned the Working Group to consider and report, with the following terms of reference:
- to consider the effectiveness of existing measures - covering driver training, driver information, awareness and education and enforcement - aimed at reducing speed-related collisions and casualties;
  - to advise on how driver and public awareness can be raised, so that drivers appreciate the impact of their actions and attitudes to others, and the benefits of safer speed behaviour to themselves and others;
  - to advise on how existing and new measures can be persuasive, positive and attractive, for maximum benefit;
  - to suggest possible further measures;
  - to consider how members of the Motorists' Forum might advance the objectives of reducing speed-related collisions and casualties; and
  - to identify actions which Motorists' Forum organisations and industries can take, to contribute to and advance the identified changes.

- 1.5 This study has therefore looked not only at whether speed affects drivers' *safety*, but also at whether they are *satisfied and comfortable as road users* with their current experience of speed on UK roads. We have also worked on the basis that the issue is *appropriate speed*<sup>1</sup> for road and traffic conditions, and *consideration for other road users*, and not just observing a speed limit.
- 1.6 This reflects our view that drivers have rights to the road, but share these rights with 32 million other drivers and all the other users of Britain's busy roads. Drivers thus have a duty of care and respect for others - so that driving is both safe, and not any more stressful than need be.
- 1.7 Although concentrated on cars and their drivers, some recommendations are equally relevant to other vehicles.
- 1.8 The study was undertaken through a series of meetings at which evidence was presented by a number of witnesses. The group however also reviewed papers from a range of sources.
- 1.9 A list of the witnesses providing evidence is at Annex A.
- 1.10 We should like to express our thanks to Leslie Packer, our adviser from the Department for Transport, and to our Secretary, David Prescott. They contributed enormously to our work. Though this report is our responsibility, it would not have been possible without their unstinting effort

## **2. Road safety and speed in the UK today – the facts and evidence**

- 2.1 The Government's road safety strategy, *Tomorrow's Roads - Safer for Everyone*, published in March 2000, set the following challenging casualty reductions targets for 2010, compared with the baseline average for 1994-98:
  - a 40% reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured in road accidents.
  - a 50% reduction in the number of children killed or seriously injured in road accidents.
  - a 10% reduction in the slight casualty rate, expressed as the number of people slightly injured per 100 million vehicle kilometres.
- 2.2 The Government's Three Year Review of the Road Safety Strategy, published in April 2004, confirmed that overall good progress is being made towards delivering these targets - the achievement of which would maintain the UK's position of having one of the best road safety records in the world. However,

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this report, and in line with the general terminology, excessive speed means driving in excess of the posted speed limit; inappropriate speed means driving at an inappropriate speed for the road, traffic or weather conditions, whatever the speed limit.

the review also reported that the number of people being killed on the UK's roads was no longer reducing.

- 2.3 The latest statistics, for 2004, show that the overall number of people killed or seriously injured has already fallen by 28%, and children by 43% compared to the original baseline average. There was also a welcome 8% decrease in the number of people killed compared with 2003 levels. But on average nine people still die on our roads each day. A further 85 are seriously injured. Many of these are car occupants. Young drivers (aged 16-24) and motorcyclists are overrepresented in these statistics. Around half the fatalities occur on rural roads<sup>2</sup>.
- 2.4 Evidence shows that speed is a contributory factor in accidents. However, most accidents have multiple causes and more research on accident causation is needed to establish relative contributions more accurately.
- 2.5 The main evidence that speed is a contributory factor in accidents can be summarised as follows:
- a) TRL research from 1999<sup>3</sup> suggests that speed contributes to about one-third of all collisions. This is broadly consistent with other research undertaken in Europe and USA.
  - b) Data collected by a number of police forces on contributory factors in collisions, which showed that over the period 1999-2002<sup>4</sup> excessive speed was a contributory factor in 12% of all collisions; 18% of those involving serious injury; and 28% of fatal collisions. Data for 2003 shows a similar picture.

These figures may if anything understate the full extent of speed as a contributory factor, for the following reasons:

- other STATS 19 contributory factors, such as *'following too close'*, or *'behaviour – careless, reckless, thoughtless'*, can be associated with or made more serious by excessive or inappropriate speed.
- the police compile STATS 19 reports after the event, or when the accident is reported to them at a police station. The police are not always therefore able to judge whether speeding was a contributory factor. And people reporting an accident to the police may not be able to identify whether there was excessive or inappropriate speed – or may not wish to admit to it.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Road Casualties Great Britain* defines Urban Roads as major and minor roads within an urban area with a population of 10 thousand or more. Rural roads are major roads and minor roads outside urban areas.

<sup>3</sup> Taylor et al 2000

<sup>4</sup> Mosedale and Purdy, DfT, *Excessive speed as a contributory factor to personal injury accidents*

- c) Research by Taylor et al<sup>5</sup> on linkages between speed management and collisions indicates that, broadly, a 1 mph reduction in average speed could be expected to reduce accident frequencies by about 5%. This work also shows that for each type of road, the frequency of collisions increases roughly with the square of the average traffic speed. For example, on urban roads in general a 10% increase in speed is associated with a 21% increase in collisions.
- d) Differences in speeds also contribute to accidents. Research by TRL suggests that if a driver drives at more than 10-15% faster than the average speed of traffic around him, he or she is more likely to be involved in a collision<sup>6</sup>.
- 2.6 TRL's more detailed investigation of the contributory factor data has improved understanding of car occupant fatalities<sup>7</sup>. But the knowledge needs to be developed further, and the Department for Transport (DfT) has in progress further in-depth studies into the underlying causes of fatal collisions.
- 2.7 In the meantime, more evidence will shortly be available from the DfT's use of teams of expert accident investigators from TRL and Loughborough University to carry out on the spot assessments of a full range of collisions, including non-fatal cases where the police do not normally do detailed reconstructions. (This is because the investigation system for road accidents, unlike those for other forms of transport, is designed to establish the cause of death and possible culpability. Investigations do not go wider partly because of the shortage of police manpower and partly to minimise traffic congestion that can arise when roads are kept shut for an extended period).
- 2.8 We welcome the detailed studies of all accidents. Work on accident causation is fundamental to sound safety policies, and should be given the highest priority. And police attending accidents should be equipped with the latest technology to enable them to measure, communicate and record exactly what happened and where. We return to this issue later.
- 2.9 Besides being a direct contributor, excessive speed can exacerbate the consequences of other bad driving practices, such as following too close and lack of attention. This is obvious for two reasons: first, the faster one is driving, the less time there is to think and take avoiding action if the unexpected occurs. Second, the laws of physics dictate that the energy generated in a collision increases with the square of the velocity.
- 2.10 The latter point is brought out by the figures on the severity of the impact on pedestrians depending on the speed of the vehicle that hit them<sup>8</sup>.
- if hit at 30mph a pedestrian has a 1 in 5 chance of being killed.

---

<sup>5</sup> Taylor et al 2000

<sup>6</sup> TRL 1998 & 1999

<sup>7</sup> J Broughton 2005

<sup>8</sup> Ashton and Mackay 1979

- at 35mph a 50% chance.
  - at 40 mph a 90% chance of being killed.
- 2.11 Besides the contribution of speed to collisions, there appears to be a more general association between fast driving and involvement in accidents. A study by Professor Stradling for the Scottish Executive<sup>9</sup> looking at speed choice, speeding infringements and involvement in crashes found that 21% of drivers who have ever been stopped for speeding or detected by cameras in the last three years said that they had been involved in a road traffic collision. This is almost double the 11% of drivers who had not been detected speeding.
- 2.12 Despite the evidence, many drivers do not see speeding as risky or dangerous. Millions of drivers do not keep to speed limits. The RAC Report on Motoring 2005, *The agony and ecstasy of driving* bears out these facts. Fifty-five percent of drivers admitted to exceeding the speed limit a little every day. Annual statistics from the DfT confirm this.

### **3. Speed. What motorists and other road users think about speed – and about the speed they would like to drive at**

- 3.1 Motoring journalism often focuses on performance and speed and tends to paint a picture where most drivers want to go fast, and faster. Some motorists clearly do. But the evidence suggests that most motorists have different priorities. Quite a few people find driving if anything fast enough already - or too fast.
- 3.2 For example, the AA Motoring Trust's regular survey of public and drivers' opinions asks for comments on the statement '*The roads would be safer if drivers kept to the speed limit*'. The responses in 1986 and 2003 showed that:
- in 1986: 38% agreed strongly with the statement; 41% agreed slightly with it.
  - in 2003: 70% agreed strongly with the statement, 18% agreed slightly with it.
- 3.3 This suggests a tendency for people, including drivers, not to want to go faster, and to regard speed limits as useful and to be respected.
- 3.4 Research carried out by Professor Stradling for the Scottish Executive included showing drivers photographs of different roads in different conditions and asking them what speed they would want to drive along each road. The majority of drivers chose speeds at or below the actual speed limit for the road in question. There is also a difference between men and women drivers: women are more inclined to choose speeds at or below the actual speed limits.

---

<sup>9</sup> Stradling 2003

- 3.5 This difference between the attitudes of men and women is reflected in driving behaviour. The most recent Home Office statistics on road offences<sup>10</sup>, for 2003 shows that men account for around 80% of speeding offences.
- 3.6 Further evidence comes from police forces and their public consultations on the crime issues which concern local residents. These consultations consistently show substantial percentages of people listing 'speeding' as one of their concerns.
- 3.7 Nonetheless, the latest edition of the DfT's *Vehicle Speeds in Great Britain* for 2004 measuring actual road speeds in free-flowing conditions shows that speed limits are frequently exceeded:
- 53% of cars exceeded the 30mph limit, with 22% driving at over 35mph.
  - 27% of cars exceeded the 40mph limit, with 10% driving at over 45mph.
  - 56% of cars exceeded the 70mph limit on motorways, with 19% exceeding 80mph.
- 3.8 On the other hand, the proportion of motorists exceeding the 30mph speed limit has fallen in the last couple of years. Three-quarters of drivers do not exceed 35 mph on roads with a 30mph limit and a clear majority of drivers were not exceeding the 40 mph limits. Additionally, while a lot of drivers exceed the motorway speed limit of 70mph, the statistics can also be seen as showing that nearly half of drivers do not go above the limit even in free-flowing conditions and more than 80% of drivers choose to stay below 80 mph.
- 3.9 Market research carried out for DfT by TNS reveals a gradual increase in the reported social unacceptability of speeding. The proportion of motorists finding it 'unacceptable' and 'highly unacceptable' to drive at 40mph in 30mph areas has risen from 60% in 1998 to 76% in 2003.
- 3.10 So, though a good deal of speeding takes place, the picture is not one of the majority of drivers anxious to go much faster. There is some evidence of drivers becoming increasingly aware of the consequences that speeding can have for others and increasingly supportive of speed limits.
- 3.11 Research in 1998<sup>11</sup> into the effects of safety cameras on drivers' behaviour suggested that drivers could be described as falling into four categories. Drivers reported either that they normally complied with speed limits ('conformers'); or that they reduced their speed to avoid detection (the 'deterred'); or that they slowed down on approach to cameras and accelerated away downstream ('manipulators'); or that they carried on as before driving well above the speed limit ('defiers'). The ideal aim should be to enlarge the

---

<sup>10</sup> Offences relating to motor vehicles England and Wales 2003, Home Office

<sup>11</sup> Clare Corbett and Frances Simon

proportion of deterred drivers, to maintain the number of those who have 'always complied' and to reduce the ranks of the defiers and manipulators.

- 3.12 A key point to remember is that there are a number of distinct reasons why drivers go at excessive or inappropriate speeds, including:
- drivers who do not have the skill and experience to know when they are driving too fast for the road or conditions;
  - drivers who deliberately ignore speed limits and do not care about other drivers and road users (some of whom do so because they know that they cannot be traced as their vehicles are not registered);
  - drivers who do not know the speed limit for the road they are on (and many drivers talk of this experience);
  - drivers who know the speed limit for the road – but it does not make sense to them;
  - drivers who feel pressured to 'go with the flow', and drive faster than they would wish; and
  - drivers under work pressures who are worried about being late either as a result of journey unreliability or simply just not giving themselves enough time for the journey.
- 3.13 This is important to recognise, because the solutions need to respond to the different reasons.

#### **4. The policy instruments**

- 4.1 Road collisions and injuries have complex causal chains. Road safety improvements cannot therefore be achieved through a single measure. Successive governments have adopted wide ranging policies which, using the 3Es - education, engineering and enforcement - target interventions to break those causal chains at a number of points.
- 4.2 Speed limits are only one instrument to manage speeds. The limits are not in themselves targets that drivers should aim to drive at and their purpose in our view is to make roads safer, not criminalise drivers. (We do not, however, advocate decriminalisation for a number of reasons, particularly given the severity of the offence and also the potential danger that enforcement of speed limits could be seen merely as a money-raising exercise).
- 4.3 The great majority of people want to drive safely and respect speed limits. Speed management policies must therefore encompass the whole range of measures to do with roads, vehicles, regulation and enforcement. So far as drivers are concerned, it should focus on raising awareness and encouraging

and assisting people to drive safely. But enforcement of speed limits is also necessary to tackle people who cause danger by disregarding speed limits.

4.4 All this requires consistency and integration between policies and action at national and local levels. And this is only deliverable through consistent and joined up collaboration between all players. The ideal is that the engineering of the road, the speed limit, all the other signs and any signals from the vehicle all tell the same story, so that the driver knows what to expect and what is expected of him or her. There should be no surprises and the risks should be obvious to the responsible driver.

4.5 The instruments available now to government, central and local, include:

- regulations setting speed limits, and legislation on penalties;
- signs and signals to indicate regulatory requirements and advice to drivers. New technology can be used to make these much more effective than the traditional static signs;
- engineering measures to eliminate dangerous features on the road and to slow down traffic in home zones, other residential areas, outside schools and so on;
- a range of education and publicity methods and materials;
- the whole range of enforcement techniques from police presence to technological devices such as cameras and automatic number plate recognition; and
- driver testing, and the regulation of training and retraining. Developments include the DfT 'Pass Plus' scheme, and Kirklees Council's 'Enhanced Pass Plus' scheme, and advanced training schemes for more experienced drivers. These are at present voluntary.

4.6 Emerging technologies have the potential to offer new options for drivers. The motor manufacturing industry has over a long period been developing improvements in the safety of vehicles, including braking and occupant protection. Now devices are available or are in development which communicate directly with the driver in the vehicle, to inform him or her about routes and traffic conditions and, potentially, about speed limits, and hazards of the road. Before long, Intelligent Speed Adaptation (ISA) devices will be available which can slow vehicles down in response to external signals.

4.7 In the context of technology, the Government has recently announced its intention to build a consensus on the issue of national road pricing. The Government's feasibility study on road pricing estimated that a national scheme could reduce urban congestion by nearly a half while reducing traffic by about 4%. The effect on road accidents remains to be assessed but one possible effect of road pricing could be a shift of traffic from safer to less safe

roads. This is an issue which Government must consider in taking forward its work on road pricing.

- 4.8 We welcome the role which the insurance industry is increasingly playing in road safety, by the development of financial incentives to drivers to meet their responsibilities by taking out insurance, and for younger drivers to drive at times where the risk is lowest.
- 4.9 So the opportunities for making real improvements in the management of speed are greater now than they have been for some time. The question is what is the right combination of policies and measures that will produce the best result both now and in the longer term, and how can they be made acceptable to the majority of motorists so that any requirements are seen as a natural feature of everyday driving, and drivers recognise when they need to refresh or improve their technical capabilities.

## **5. The Road Safety Deal**

- 5.1 As has been shown, the intellectual, moral and practical case for the management of speed is clear. Much can be done through continued improvement in vehicle and road engineering. But human factors are present in all accidents: and drivers must play their full part by driving more considerately, more attentively and more skillfully.
- 5.2 Measures to change driver behaviour will not work without public acceptance. As the recent public debate on safety cameras has shown, this cannot be taken for granted. Past experience, for example in drink-driving and seat belt wearing, show that people will accept measures that make sense and bring solid benefits. But acceptance takes time and intelligent explanation.
- 5.3 Our view is that the majority of drivers support *sensible* speed limits, want to drive safely and want to keep within the law. But millions still break speed limits regularly and speeding is generally only seen as a crime when it has serious consequences. So what can we do to get the public acceptance required to ensure that drivers recognise that they need both to change their behaviour and perceptions?
- 5.4 Our suggestion is a *Road Safety Deal* to which all the key players would commit. These include Government, drivers, the road authorities, the enforcement authorities, the motor industry, the insurance industry and employers. We set out below the various commitments that we believe that individuals and authorities should make as part of this *Deal* if they share our ambition to cut the number of deaths and injuries on the roads.

- **Government**

- 5.5 Only the Government has the authority and resources to drive forward major new initiatives in road safety; so it is a key player in any *Road Safety Deal* and must provide the leadership to drive the *Deal* forward.

- 5.6 Government should further develop research and data collection to improve knowledge of accident causation, which must underpin road safety measures. In particular, it should look at the arrangements for the reporting of accidents (especially Stats 19) in order to ensure that the information collected is as complete and accurate as possible in order to provide a sound basis for research on the causes and consequences of accidents.
- 5.7 New technology can help here. For example, providing police officers with hand held computer equipment which would enable information to be inputted quicker and more accurately would improve the quality of data as well as saving police time. If equipment were provided to record accurately and comprehensively the relevant features of the scene of collisions, that would not only improve the quality and quantity of the data; it would also enable the wreckage to be cleared away more quickly, thus reducing delays to traffic. We understand that such equipment exists and that DfT is funding a project to develop software for use on these devices. We urge Government to work with the police to ensure that better recording methodologies are made available to the police as soon as possible.
- 5.8 We also recommend a more systematic sharing of data between the police, the insurance industry and local authorities covering individuals' behaviour and accident causation. At present, there appears to be some inhibition on the exchange of information between the relevant parties. This is unhelpful for progressing research and investigations into particular accidents and hinders action being taken to rectify the causes of such accidents. Government should investigate what information is held by the relevant parties and examine the possible inhibitions on the exchange of data between the parties. Government should also consider whether a system of routine exchange of data could be introduced.
- 5.9 Government should continue to use this research, data collection and other information to raise awareness and understanding of the consequences of speed and reason for speed limits. It should try to ensure that systems are set up that will enable such information from accidents to be passed to the appropriate bodies or manufacturers who are in a position to act on it.
- 5.10 Government (together with local authorities, safety organisations and motoring organisations) should provide drivers with a clear, consistent and up-to-date account of 'Why speed matters' – including latest information from the 'On The Spot' study of collisions and their causes. It should also maintain and refresh *Think* information and publicity programmes, continuously monitoring the effectiveness of the campaigns
- 5.11 Speed limits must be realistic and clearly signed: otherwise there is no chance that they will be observed. DfT has been working on new guidance for local authorities on setting speed limits for their roads. We urge the Department to finalise this guidance by the end of 2005 at the latest. It should then monitor and review its implementation.

- 5.12 We comment on the signing of speed limits later in this report. But one issue which requires attention by central government is the national speed limit sign – the white disk with a diagonal black bar through it. This sign is meant to indicate a 70mph limit on a dual carriageway road and 60mph on a single carriageway, because these are the national limits applicable to these roads. This ambiguity is unhelpful, particularly as many drivers do not know that the limit for single carriageways is 60mph. We recommend that the Department should review this sign, and phase it out. It should be replaced with signs indicating the actual speed limit for the road.
- 5.13 Government should encourage best practice in road safety measures, whether engineering, enforcement or communication. The Government, in the form of the DfT, should devise and implement experiments and demonstrations of new ideas for tackling safety problems, including those being looked at abroad. DfT should also try out and demonstrate the variety of physical ways of slowing down traffic in streets which are primarily residential, or near schools, to evaluate their effects.
- 5.14 Demonstration projects have a proven, valuable role to play in developing different approaches to reducing casualties. The Gloucester 'Safer City' initiative has, for example, shown that an innovative approach - in this case, tackling safety problems on all roads within the city boundary by integrating safety into wider work rather than using a piecemeal response to particular accidents or individual locations - can lead to substantially reduced casualties. We recommend that Government should continue to run such projects and promote best practice arising from these projects.
- 5.15 A good way of disseminating best practice already exists in the form of the Molasses database (Monitoring Of Local Authority Safety SchemES). This contains information about local road safety schemes implemented by local authorities in the UK. Set up as a tool for monitoring and promulgating the effectiveness of schemes, the reporting of schemes has been sporadic to date and so its usefulness is limited. We recommend Government should develop Molasses further as a tool for local authority monitoring purposes, identifying both measures which have worked and those which have not.
- 5.16 Government should ensure that local authorities have sufficient funding to step up their spending on safety road engineering schemes and regular maintenance. It should also consider whether present systems for central support to local authority expenditure are adequate for the requisite priority to be given to safety road engineering schemes, bearing in mind the high ratio of benefits to costs.
- 5.17 Government should set a right and consistent regulatory framework and penalties structure. It must, in particular, continue to take strong measures against those who drive uninsured, untaxed and/or unlicensed. By being outside the systems for the control and regulation of vehicles and drivers, such people undermine the effectiveness of these systems, as well as increasing costs and risks for those who abide by the rules.

- 5.18 Government should support the earliest possible availability of technology to communicate information about speed to drivers in their vehicles (see the section on the manufacturing industry) and in particular should work to facilitate a national e-database of speed limits. Work by Ordnance Survey is well advanced. Government should commit itself to a target date for the introduction of such maps showing speed limits in Great Britain.
- 5.19 Government should also ensure that its own car fleet, including those operated by its Agencies, is equipped with the ISA technology for providing information on speed limits and prospectively regulating speed. This would send a powerful signal to the outside world that Government supported the use of the new systems.
- 5.20 The technology to use the On-Board Diagnostics to record data about what was happening to a vehicle involved in an accident is already available: indeed information can already be obtained from some vehicles in the event of an accident, though there are currently issues about the release of such information. Government should facilitate the development of specifications for such “Black boxes” and implement regulations to require the fitting of such equipment in new vehicles.
- 5.21 We appreciate there will be concerns about this proposal but we believe there is a justification for it in the public interest, and that it offers advantages to the law-abiding motorist. Our view is that drivers may be encouraged to drive safely and well where they know that their good driving is being recorded and can be demonstrated in the event of an accident, including proving innocence (as the current tachograph equipment used in lorries has done). The information recorded on the “Black boxes” should also provide valuable information on accident causation and give a better understanding of why accidents happen.
- 5.22 The privacy concerns regarding this proposal are appreciated. To overcome these, we recommend that information should only be made available to the police and enforcement authorities after an accident and that no real time monitoring of the data should be allowed.
- 5.23 Government itself has responsibilities in its role as Highway Authority for the nation’s Trunk Roads. We welcome the progress that the Highways Agency is making in reaching its casualty reduction targets.
- 5.24 Many road safety reports over the past few years have commented on the lack of capability at a local level within the road safety profession as a barrier to undertaking the implementation of road safety engineering schemes. Government should ensure that steps are taken to tackle the skills shortages in road safety. Government, through the Highways Agency, could itself demonstrate a commitment in this area by recruiting and training people as road safety engineers as a means of increasing the workforce in this area.
- 5.25 Government should ensure that the training and testing regime for learner drivers remains relevant to today’s driving conditions. Young drivers continue

- to be involved in a disproportionately high number of accidents and the time may be right to take stock of the level of driver training and testing, including whether this should be extended to behaviour and attitude as well as basic driving skills. The review should also take stock of the standards and requirements for driver instructors.
- 5.26 This review should also look at the post-training of novice drivers, while they are still early in the process of forming their approach to driving and attitudes to other road users.
- 5.27 Government should consider including training in road safety and considerate behaviour on the roads in the education curriculum. This is part of learning to live in a civilised society. The earlier that young people are taught to use the roads safely, the more likely they are to acquire the right attitudes and habits. There is an important role for local authority road safety officers here. We should like to see local authorities employing more of them, and the officers having the access to schools that they need.
- 5.28 Government should continue to encourage vehicle manufacturers to improve car design to provide increased protection for pedestrians and cyclists, and play a full part in international negotiations on the appropriate standards.

### **Specific Commitments**

Government should continue to:

- develop its programme of research and data collection needed to underpin sound road safety measures and to continue to use this information to raise awareness and understanding of the consequences of speed and reason for speed limits.
- finalise the updated guidance to Traffic Authorities on setting local speed limits by the end of 2005 at the latest and monitor and review its implementation.
- review the national speed limit sign and replace it with signs specifically indicating whether the limit is 70 or 60 mph.
- stimulate innovation and experiment and disseminate best practice by demonstration projects and other means.
- provide increased resources for local authority road safety improvements.
- set a right and consistent regulatory framework and penalties structure.
- facilitate the establishment of a national e-database of speed limits, and generally facilitate the emergence of in-car information technology.
- facilitate the agreement of specifications for “Black boxes” and regulations requiring the fitting of such equipment in new vehicles.
- ensure that skills shortages in road safety are tackled.
- encourage vehicle manufacturers to improve car design to provide

increased protection for pedestrians and cyclists.

Government should also:

- work with the police to ensure that better recording methodologies are made available to the police as soon as possible.
- investigate what information covering individuals' behaviour and accident causation is held by the relevant parties, examine the possible inhibitions on the exchange of this data between the parties and consider whether a system of routine exchange of data could be introduced.
- consider ways to make the Molasses database a more effective tool for reporting on and disseminating information about local authority safety engineering schemes.
- ensure that its own car fleet, including those operated by its Agencies, is equipped with the ISA technology.
- take stock of the training and testing regime for learner drivers, including whether this should cover behaviour and attitude as well as basic skills and also the standards and requirements for driver instructors themselves.
- include road safety training in the education curriculum

- **Drivers**

- 5.29 Drivers have a responsibility to ensure that they are properly trained to drive safely in the conditions of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Typically, having passed their driving test, they continue to drive for over 50 years without ever getting any further training. And the existing driving test does not cover tasks such as motorway and night driving.
- 5.30 Road traffic is forecast to continue to increase for very many years ahead: cars have increasingly sophisticated equipment on board, and navigating the roads will become more demanding as the Government and other highway authorities make more use of traffic management techniques to squeeze more capacity out of the road network.
- 5.31 So we consider that continuing training for drivers should be available and should be publicised. We are not recommending that such re-training should be compulsory but we would hope that responsible drivers would recognise the value of updating and refreshing their skills generally or perhaps at important points in their lives which change the amount or kind of driving they do - for example when they change jobs, have children, retire and so on.
- 5.32 We also recommend that young or novice drivers should be encouraged to undertake further training. The "Pass Plus" scheme offers instruction on those skills not tested in the current driving examination and we think that the take-up of this scheme should be encouraged. We are impressed also by a trial scheme - the Kirklees experiment - that teaches not only driving skills but also attempts to instill responsible attitudes in young drivers. If this succeeds, it

seems well worth incorporating education in responsible behaviour into training courses. It would be helpful if the insurance industry were prepared to offer incentives to those who undertake soundly based training programmes.

- 5.33 Drivers should take a pride in their driving, in the same way as they would undertake any other skilled function. Drivers should also have a responsibility to ensure that they give undivided attention to their driving. If they want to make mobile phone calls or change CDs etc, they should pull off the road to somewhere safe.
- 5.34 Drivers should think about other people with whom they share the road, and should be considerate. So called road-rage is as unacceptable as starting a fight in a factory or an office. Research has shown that bad behaviour on the road is often associated with bad behaviour generally: the same people do it. We welcome the commitment given in the recently announced Roads Policing Strategy issued by DfT, the Home Office and the Association of Chief Police Officers, to which the Government and the police committed themselves, that the police will challenge unlawful and unruly behaviour. It is essential that the commitments in the strategy are fully implemented.
- 5.35 This report does not deal with motorcyclists specifically. But we must comment on our concern that motorcyclists continue to be disproportionately represented in casualty numbers. (Although motorcycles only account for 1% of road mileage, riders accounted for 20% of fatalities in 2003 and statistics show that motorcyclists are 40 times more likely to be killed than car drivers and 5 times more likely to be killed than cyclists). We believe that additional training for motorcyclists should be considered and support moves to develop effective training arrangements to enable riders to improve their standards. The BikeSafe initiative is a good example of what can be done and we are aware of the work being undertaken by the Institute of Highway Engineers in this area.

### **Specific Commitments**

Drivers should:

- keep to the rules of the road at all times.
- take a pride in their driving.
- drive at an appropriate speed for road and traffic conditions.
- undertake further training, or re-training, at appropriate times in a driving career.
- give full attention to driving at all times.
- be considerate to other people on the road.

- **Local Highway Authorities**

- 5.36 There is a clear need for Highway Authorities to make our roads safe, intelligible and predictable. In addition, authorities need to ensure that the rules on their roads make sense and that a balance is struck between the needs of residents and road users. Some local authorities are already developing a functional hierarchy of roads within their areas, which distinguishes between roads for through traffic, those for local access and streets serving housing developments. The objective should be to ensure that traffic uses the roads which are suitable for its purpose, and is travelling at the appropriate speed. Where necessary this should involve the adoption of engineering measures to reduce traffic speeds. Signs are important: if through traffic is not expected to use particular roads, the alternative routes should be clearly signed.
- 5.37 Many local authority roads are still not engineered or maintained to a high standard of safety. So continued improvement of road condition is needed. Relatively easy and inexpensive measures such as junction improvements, continued maintenance of signs and road markings and skid resistant surfaces can all have large benefits in relation to costs compared with other areas of expenditure. Studies on road safety over the last 30 years have demonstrated this. Local authorities, of course, already invest in measures designed to improve road safety and all authorities should give a much higher priority to safety engineering. The Government should commit to provide resources for these improvements having regard to their cost-effectiveness and the opportunities they bring for early benefits and improvements; and should monitor performance and give technical help on the identification and design of remedies.
- 5.38 An early task is to estimate the extent and cost of the work involved. We have not ourselves had the resources or time to do this; it is, in any case, a job for DfT with the local authorities. As an example, it is estimated that the cost of bringing the strategic traffic routes in Essex (708km consisting of most A roads and some B roads) up to a realistic high safety standard is in the order of £252m. This equates to roughly £350,000 per km. This includes any resurfacing, minor realignment, signs, road markings, crossings and passive safety measures but not major realignment or new road construction. Grossed up for the whole of England, the cost would be substantial. But the benefit in terms of lives saved and injuries avoided, would be even more substantial; and the return higher than almost any other transport investment.
- 5.39 It is often unclear what the speed limit is on quite long stretches of road, including those roads with a 30mph speed limit indicated by the presence of a system of streetlights. It is futile to expect drivers to observe them in these circumstances. Speed limits must be clearly signed with repeater signs where necessary so that drivers are in no doubt as to what the limit is for a stretch of road. Drivers' attention should be specifically drawn to areas where the speed limit drops by more than 20mph. To avoid excessive clutter from street furniture, consideration should be given to painting the speed limit on the road,

- which some local authorities already do. Authorities should also ensure that their traffic regulation orders which impose speed limits are correct.
- 5.40 Most importantly, it is essential that highway authorities should review the speed limits on all roads in the light of guidance in the new DfT Circular on the setting of local speed limits, which is currently being prepared. Authorities' reviews must be evidenced based and should ensure that the reasons for speed limits are intelligible to responsible drivers. Currently there are roads where different speed limits apply on different sections of the roads for no obvious reason and other roads where speed limits appear to be too low. Speed limits set purely for community re-assurance may not command respect.
- 5.41 Such reviews - if they reflect the new DfT Circular - should ensure greater clarity and consistency in the setting of speed limits both locally and nationally. Authorities should also undertake this review as part of the speed management strategy that they are required to produce as part of their Local Transport Plan.
- 5.42 We believe that such a review will be fundamental to ensuring drivers "buy-in" to the need to conform to speed limits. Indeed, such is the importance we place on this matter that we would like to set a timescale by which authorities need to have reviewed the speed limits on each of their roads. We recommend that within 12 months of DfT's new Circular having been issued, local authorities should identify their plans to review speed limits. The review of A and B class roads should be completed by 2011 at the latest.
- 5.43 Once authorities have decided on an appropriate speed limit for a road, they should be prepared to account publicly for why that limit has been selected.
- 5.44 We recommend that local authorities should consider establishing local Road Safety Forums, bringing together both the relevant authorities with statutory responsibilities, including highway authorities, the police and health authorities but also the other groups with an interest or influence, including road user groups and major employers. Such Forums would go wider than the present Safety Camera Partnerships, which though made up of elected highway authorities and the police are criticised by some as not sufficiently accountable.
- 5.45 The objective of these Forums - which need not take exactly the same shape everywhere but can reflect local circumstances - will be to provide a means for the statutory highway, police and other authorities to integrate their highway, enforcement and road safety work, involving other local stakeholders.
- 5.46 Road humps are an important element of an authority's toolkit to control inappropriate and excessive speeding in streets that are predominantly for people on foot. But they are not an unmixed blessing because of the noise and pollution they cause. We believe that there can be a tendency for authorities to put in humps before alternatives have been considered. We support the use of humps in residential areas or Home Zones but we have

concerns about the installation of humps on main roads which are primarily used by through traffic. Where speed limits are not effective on main urban roads, we recommend that local authorities should look to install other traffic calming measure instead of road humps.

### **Specific Commitments**

Local authorities should:

- ensure our road systems are safe, intelligible and predictable.
- set out a functional hierarchy of roads, adopting appropriate engineering measures and signs to direct traffic to the appropriate routes.
- continue to improve roads physically.
- give appropriate priority to investing in measures designed to improve road safety, including employing more road safety officers to strengthen road safety education in schools.
- ensure speed limits are clearly signposted.
- review the speed limits on all roads in the light of guidance in the new DfT Circular on the setting of local speed limits. This review of A and B roads should be completed by 2011 at the latest.
- establish local Road Safety Forums to provide a means for highway, police and other authorities to integrate their work, involving other local stakeholders.
- limit road humps primarily to residential or HomeZone areas.

- ***Enforcement Authorities***

5.47 Part of the deal is that drivers should drive at an appropriate speed within the speed limit and respect one another. We believe most drivers are law abiding and will behave in this way. But a minority of drivers will not, for various reasons, comply with the law even at risk to their own lives and those of other people. In such circumstances there is a need for an appropriate level of enforcement.

5.48 The proportion of resources put into traffic policing by police authorities has fallen substantially in recent years - down from about 15% in 1981 to about 5% in 2003 - and this is at a time of significant increases in traffic levels. While we recognise both the increased use of technology, such as Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR), for enforcement purposes and the many and increasing calls on police time to tackle serious crime, we are concerned about this reduction in traffic police. The physical presence of police on the roads encourages responsible driving, and it is necessary to deal with the many offences which cannot be enforced by automatic devices.

5.49 We therefore welcome the Roads Policing Strategy which identifies speed as one of the police priorities. It is essential that the police should press forward

- quickly on their commitment to develop local bottom line indicators of success in dealing with road safety.
- 5.50 But the police role in enforcement should not be restricted to just dealing with speed related matters. Indeed, we believe that the amount of resources devoted by the respective enforcement authorities to controlling speeding and parking contraventions is out of balance to the enforcement applied to other equally important issues. For example, the number of breath tests administered in recent years has fallen; there is too little enforcement activity applied to behavioural offences. We believe strongly that the police must widen and strengthen their overall enforcement activities if our roads are to be policed effectively, and therefore welcome the commitment in the Roads Policing Strategy to the tackling of a full range of issues, including drink driving, careless and threatening driving and seat belt wearing, as well as speeding.
- 5.51 With the reduction in police resources dedicated to traffic policing has come an increased reliance on technology, in particular safety cameras. The independent report prepared for DfT on the first three years of the safety camera programme's operation (2000-01 to 2002-03) found that:
- there was a 32% reduction in the number of vehicles exceeding the speed limit, and a higher 42% reduction in the vehicles significantly exceeding the limit (15 mph above the limit or more).
  - there was a 40% reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured at camera sites (including mobile camera sites where camera equipment was deployed only from time to time) above and beyond the general downward trend in UK road casualties.
  - there was a strong correlation between the reduction in speed seen at a site, and the level of casualty reduction at that site.
- 5.52 In the light of this, we recommend that the Government should maintain its current Safety Camera Programme but that the Programme should be kept under review as part of the Government's total speed policy package.
- 5.53 We do, however, caution against a continuing extension in the number of cameras deployed – the answer to the speeding debate cannot be an ever increasing number of cameras. This would not be a balanced response to the problem.
- 5.54 Instead, we consider that any future camera strategy should look carefully at police proposals for a “hazard route” approach. (This approach is designed to deal with roads which have serious levels of casualties which occur over longer stretches and are not concentrated at particular points). Here - as in all cases - cameras must **not** be an automatic first step. The use of cameras must be part of a comprehensive traffic management approach to the stretch of road, including: a review of speed limits in line with the planned new DfT Circular on setting local speed limits; use of signing and driver information; the

- full range of effective and relevant highway design measures; and publicity measures. Cameras should only be deployed after the local highway authority has confirmed that no other cost effective engineering solution can be implemented to improve road safety.
- 5.55 We also recommend that the speed limit be signed both on the safety camera itself and also on all warning signs right up to the camera. This simple move would raise drivers' awareness of the maximum speed they should be driving at.
- 5.56 The role that the Safety Camera Partnerships play should be reviewed, with two changes in particular in mind. First, although Safety Camera Partnerships are made up of elected highway authorities and the police, critics argue that the partnerships are not seen as sufficiently accountable to local people. To respond to this criticism, the highway and police authorities for each partnership should address the issue, and ensure that their work is fully open to the local communities they serve and that this is publicised and clear to all.
- 5.57 Our second proposal should help improve accountability. It is that the Local Road Safety Forums we have recommended above should include the work of Safety Camera Partnerships.
- 5.58 Along with these changes, we believe that partnerships should be free to spend their surpluses on a much wider range of safety measures than currently permitted in the DfT Rules and Guidance for the safety camera programme, including engineering measures. If this proposal is agreed, it will be necessary to ensure that this use of fine revenues is *additional* to the funding local authorities were going to spend on safety related matters and does not lead to authorities diverting their existing road safety spending to other budgets. But we stress that the fundamental reason for deploying cameras must be to improve safety, not raise revenue.
- 5.59 We understand that in a number of partnerships, it is expected that the surpluses will shortly disappear. Government will therefore need to revisit the financial basis of the partnerships that they should be self-funding.
- 5.60 Whilst safety cameras are an integral part of the Government's road safety strategy, public perception of the camera programme may threaten support for it. The present system, where those caught speeding by a safety camera are automatically subject to a £60 fine and 3 penalty points (or have the option of going to court) can harden, rather than change, the recipient's attitude.
- 5.61 We therefore welcome recent initiatives by a number of police forces in offering those caught driving a little over the speed limit the chance to attend a speed awareness course. We understand that attendance on such courses can have a positive effect on offenders, who respond to the emphasis on being given the opportunity and help to drive better, rather than punishment as the automatic resort. We welcome the plans by ACPO to put in place a national programme, with consistent rules of eligibility and course content. We urge all Police Forces to introduce such courses at the earliest opportunity.

- 5.62 However, we believe that the option of attending a speed awareness course, operated to national guidelines, should be offered to all first time offenders, as an alternative to an automatic penalty. We believe this will encourage those taking part to think about their behaviour and change it.
- 5.63 We also welcome the Government's proposals in the Road Safety Bill to give the courts powers to offer offenders retraining as part of the penalties for a range of offences, including speeding cases which come to court. This should build on the positive experience of drink drive awareness courses in helping change behaviour.

### **Specific Commitments**

- the police should implement their pledge in the Roads Policing Strategy to challenge the whole range of road police issues, including unlawful and unruly behaviour as well as speeding.
- the police should implement quickly their commitment in the Strategy to develop local bottom line indicators of success in dealing with road safety including speeding.
- Government, police and local authorities should consider developing a "hazard route" approach within the safety camera programme but with cameras not being used as an automatic first step but as part of a comprehensive speed management package for the route.
- speed limits should be signed on safety cameras and warning signs.
- Safety Camera Partnerships should be involved with the Road Safety Forum arrangements recommended above.
- Safety Camera Partnerships' surpluses should be applied to a wider range of safety measures than currently permitted.
- Government should review the financial basis of the Camera Partnerships.
- all police forces should offer the option of attending a speed awareness course, operated to national guidelines, to all first time offenders as an alternative to an automatic penalty.

### **• *Motor Industry***

- 5.64 The motor industry has a big part to play in ensuring that our roads remain safe and is already developing a whole range of new vehicle technology systems. These include a variety of in-car communications, Intelligent Speed Adaptation (ISA), intelligent air bags and collision avoidance/lane guidance systems.
- 5.65 Technological devices to tell drivers what the speed limit is on a particular road are well within the technical ability of the industry to produce. The sooner these are fitted to all new vehicles, the better. Once a national e-database of speed limits is in place (see above), drivers will be able to know the speed limit at all times, without having to look for road signs.

- 5.66 The facilities to advise drivers of the speed they are driving at can operate at a range of levels, ranging through:
- dashboard information to the driver on the speed limit being driven through;
  - audible or visual indication to the driver that the vehicle is exceeding the speed limit;
  - linkage into the vehicle, slowing it down to the speed limit, with driver override option; and
  - full vehicle control.
- 5.67 One piece of equipment in this area which DfT is currently trialling is the ISA system which slows the vehicle down if it is travelling above the speed limit. The system can either be in operation permanently or can be selected by the driver if he or she wants it operated. A field trial using the ISA technology has been undertaken in Leeds by the Institute for Transport Studies. We welcome the evidence emerging from these trials and believe that a *voluntary, driver selected* system would be welcomed by many drivers (although we also recognise it will not be welcomed by every driver).
- 5.68 We recognise that there are costs attached to the fitting of the equipment on the vehicle but we believe this facility is one which some drivers will value and be prepared to pay for - as already evident from camera information devices and other existing products. The price per unit should fall significantly as the equipment penetrates the market, as has happened with the ABS braking system. We do not recommend that the cost of the supporting infrastructure, including the database and the transmission equipment, should fall on the motorist, as we believe that the public interest will be best served the faster this facility is in general use.
- 5.69 More generally, we also recommend that the motor industry should continue to support the development and of new in-car information technology systems and the development of devices for collision avoidance and damage minimisation. Again the costs to industry must be recognised but as with the ISA technology, we believe that these new facilities will be ones which some drivers will value and be prepared to pay for.
- 5.70 The question of On-Board Diagnostics (“Black boxes”) has been discussed in the Government section. We merely record here that we hope the industry will work with Government as it moves to agree specifications for such “Black boxes” and the fitting of such equipment in new vehicles.
- 5.71 Market penetration into the vehicle parc of in-car information systems will be key to this technology becoming mainstream. In order to gain such market penetration, we recommend fleet operators and company fleets should take up new technology opportunities. The Forum’s recent report on work-related road safety highlighted both why organisations should do more to improve the

safety performance of people driving as part of their work and the strong business case there is for improving safety in this area.

- 5.72 We also recommend that vehicle rental operators should consider equipping their vehicles with such technology. (Rental vehicles would be a powerful way of demonstrating new things to multiple users). Doing so could act as a powerful incentive for people to use the services of those companies who fit this technology into their rental vehicles.
- 5.73 We hope that the motor industry will maintain the letter and spirit of its voluntary restraints on speed in its advertising (including images on internet and other new advertisement media). Whilst the industry does much good work in this area, it should consider how it might more actively engage in or support national and local *Think* campaigns.

#### **Specific commitments**

- the motor industry should continue to support the development of new in-car information technology systems and the development of devices for collision avoidance and damage minimisation.
- fleet operators and company fleets should take up new technology opportunities.
- vehicle rental companies should consider introducing such technology into their vehicles. The Government should discuss this with the operators.
- the motor industry should maintain the letter and spirit of its volunteer restraints on speed in its advertising and engage in *Think* initiatives.

#### **• Insurance Industry**

- 5.74 The insurance industry also has a key role to play as its everyday business involves assessing risks associated with particular individuals.
- 5.75 We hope that the industry will continue to be proactive in evaluating technological developments and their collision risk benefits and develop appropriate new insurance products which reward those who adopt the new technology.
- 5.76 We hope also that the industry will continue to encourage retraining for drivers at mid-career points. We hope that it will develop new insurance products that encourage, and reward, careful driving and continual improvement in driving skills.
- 5.77 We welcome the recent interim report and consultation paper issued by the Association of British Insurers "*Young Drivers: Road Safety and the Cost of Motoring*" that identifies the causes of motor accidents among the young and proposes 10 basic steps that drivers could follow to improve their safety and reduce their motoring costs. The insurance industry should also carry forward

the initiatives it has already begun on making insurance more affordable for young drivers, in order to help combat uninsured driving (bearing in mind that non-insurance can become a habit, and uninsured drivers will be untouched by the insurance-linked incentives referred to above). We hope that the industry will ensure that young drivers who undertake soundly based training and testing schemes find this additional training reflected in cheaper insurance.

- 5.78 As discussed in paragraph 5.8, we have recommended that a more systematic sharing of data between the police, the insurance industry and local authorities on individuals' behaviour and accident causation should be considered. We hope that the insurance industry will play its part in any such review.

### **Specific commitments**

The insurance industry should:

- encourage new technology developments designed to reduce collision risk by rewarding those who use such technology.
- continue to offer incentives for motorists to undertake effective training courses and to drive safely.
- work with other interested parties to make insurance more affordable for young drivers and to reward those young drivers who undertake additional training.

### **• *Motoring Organisations***

- 5.79 Motoring organisations can contribute by mounting their own campaigns on safer driving and maintaining standards of competence and consideration. They are well placed to keep in touch with the opinions and concerns of motorists and therefore to construct campaigns which respond to these. They should undertake regular polling to ascertain motorists' concerns.
- 5.80 Organisations should also continue their support for the European Road Assessment Programme. This programme offers a real opportunity to drive up the safety standards of our roads.
- 5.81 Motoring organisations include those offering breakdown assistance and other services to members, organisations concerned with public policy issues and those representing particular groups such as motorcyclists. All have a part to play.

## Specific Commitments

Motoring organisations should:

- commit to reinforcing road safety messages, particularly as regards the importance of driving at an appropriate speed.
- reinforce the message that people should be fully trained and up to the task of driving under current circumstances.
- offer continued support for the European Road Assessment Programme.

- **Employers**

- 5.82 The Motorists' Forum recent report on work-related road safety - which can be viewed at [www.cfit.gov.uk/mf/reports/wrrs/index.htm](http://www.cfit.gov.uk/mf/reports/wrrs/index.htm) - found that there is evidence that people travelling as part of their work are at greater risk of accident - indeed it is estimated that between one quarter and one third of all road accidents occur when people are making work-related journeys. However it is the aspect of work-related safety which receives least attention by employers with recent research showing that 79% of respondents had yet to compile a car fleet risk management study. The activity is also often overlooked by, or even exempted from, general road safety initiatives.
- 5.83 The Forum's report advised Government on how companies and other organisations can be encouraged and helped to raise their road safety standards. The study concluded that:-
- this is an area where some employers have already achieved remarkable reductions in accidents through the introduction of relatively simple measures;
  - companies could make substantial cost savings by adopting good practice in the management of work-related driving activities;
  - there is ample advice on good practice which would help employers achieve major improvements.
- 5.84 To try to overcome the obstacles in tackling this issue more effectively, the group made a number of recommendations. Many of these relate to Government (and are not touched upon in this report) but we have also recommended that employers themselves must see work-related driving as an integral part of their health and safety management processes and afford it the management priority it deserves.

## Specific Commitments

Employers should:

- have a Health and Safety policy dealing with the risks of work-related driving in place.
- have a top-level commitment to work-related road safety in an organisation.
- have a clear line of accountability.
- have adequate systems in place for carrying out risk assessments and delivering training.
- monitor performance to ensure that a work-related road safety policy is effective.

## 6. Conclusion

- 6.1 The management of speed is an important element in any successful effort to reduce deaths and injuries on the roads. We think that it is time for a new initiative, building on the work in the DfT report *New Directions in Speed Management*, taking account of recent experience, and looking ahead to what technology can contribute.
- 6.2 To devise a strategy which is both effective and commands the support of the motoring public is not straightforward. This report sets out our approach. This recognises that the interaction between the road, the vehicle and the driver is complex, and that effective action will involve many players. All of them need to commit to programmes of coordinated action in a whole range of areas including engineering, technology, training, communication, regulation and its enforcement. We have called this commitment to coordinated action '*The Deal*'.
- 6.3 If this approach is accepted by the Government, it will need an action programme to take it forward. We suggest that the Government should bring together representatives of all the organisations involved. Each should be asked whether they are prepared to commit themselves to the proposals in the report; or, if not, to suggest other proposals which they think more effective or more practical. In either event, they should be asked to put forward the specific steps they would take in their areas.
- 6.4 This coordinated programme could then be monitored regularly. The Government could publish regular reports bringing together the statistics of road accidents, on speeding offences, on drivers' attitudes, on training and retraining, and on the various other measures recommended, including the results of the experiments and demonstration projects we recommend. We could then all see for ourselves whether we were making progress: what works; where more effort is required; and which policies might need rethinking.

- 6.5 Regular monitoring reports could then provide a focus for motoring organisations, road safety organisations and others to devise their own campaigns, targeting particular aspects of the problem, including driver behaviour and skills. Others, such as motor manufacturers and insurance companies could use these occasions to highlight new developments in their areas. We believe that if people, including drivers, can see that progress is being made in sensible and relevant ways towards the common objective, and to their advantage, they are more likely to play their part, and the result will be greater than that achievable by actions taken in isolation.

***Motorists' Forum  
August 2005***

**WITNESSES PROVIDING EVIDENCE**

<b><u>NAME</u></b>	<b><u>ORGANISATION</u></b>
Paul Butler	Policy and e-assessment Director, Driver Standards Agency
David Murphy	Head of Marketing, DfT
Jo Rushton	Head of Transport Publicity, DfT
Brian Goodwin	Highways and Transportation Network Manager, Essex County Council
Rosemary Welch	Highways and Transportation Traffic and Safety Manager, Essex County Council
Eric Sampson	Head of Transport Technology and Standards Division, DfT
Chief Supt Jon Bond	Warwickshire Police
Prof. Steve Stradling	Transport Research Institute, Napier University, Edinburgh
Dr Samantha Jamson	Senior Research Fellow, Institute for Transport Studies, University of Leeds
Justin Jacobs	Head of Motor Insurance and Risk Pricing, Association of British Insurers
Simon Montague	Ex-Transport Correspondent, BBC