



## Introduction and Background

Kent County Council is committed to ensuring all significant council decisions are subject to appropriate consultation processes and that the people of Kent are involved in the decision making process, as per KCC's Bold Steps for Kent policy.

The County Council has produced a new Road Casualty Reduction Strategy which is aimed at drawing on the latest data and research available to refocus road safety interventions, as well as improving the effectiveness of working with partners and stakeholders.

It is intended that the Road Casualty Reduction Strategy will impact positively on the health and safety of the people of Kent and on visitors. It represents investment of public money and implementation of policies. It is therefore important that it takes account of the views of stakeholders and that it has been subjected to a robust consultation process.

The Strategy was developed from a workshop held on 13 November 2013 to which key stakeholders, including all County Council Members, and representative and interest groups, were invited. The resulting Strategy was then subjected to a full public consultation from 23 December 2013 to 24 February 2014. The Strategy has been reviewed in light of the consultation responses and certain parts have been made clearer and sections refined. There have been no significant changes. This underlines the value of holding the workshop prior to developing the Strategy. The key issues raised by consultation respondents have been outlined below in the responses section along with answers or clarifications.

It is intended that the Strategy is recommended for approval by the Cabinet Member for Transport & Environment, subject to a report to the Growth, Environment & Transport Cabinet Committee on 24 April 2014. This Consultation Report and the Equalities Impact Assessment will be included as appendices to the Cabinet Committee Report.

KCC is grateful to all those who responded to the consultation and assisted in the development of the Road Casualty Reduction Strategy.

## Consultation Process

### Stakeholders

Road safety has the potential to impact on all parts of the community and as such the stakeholder group is very broad, including all residents of and visitors to Kent. All road users, including drivers, passengers, cyclists and pedestrians are all directly affected by the factors the Strategy seeks to address. This made it important to maintain a long running consultation on Kent.gov to ensure that the wider public had sufficient time to review KCC's proposals and give reasonable feedback, as well as directly contacting key stakeholder and representative groups to personally invite responses.

### Workshop

A pre-consultation workshop was held on 13 November 2013, under the chairmanship of David Eades (a prominent BBC radio commentator), which brought together stakeholders from different interested groups to discuss casualty reduction priorities, road safety opinions and road user experiences. The information gathered in the course of this event was used to shape the Strategy before public release to ensure it took account of the concerns of key stakeholders. The attending groups included representatives of:

- Alliance of British Drivers
- British Horse Society
- County Council Members
- Cycle Forums
- Disabled Access Groups
- Disabled & Sensory Impairment Groups
- Highways Agency
- Independent Advocacy Scheme
- Institute of Advanced Motorists
- KCC Education, Learning & Skills Directorate
- Kent Association for the Blind
- Kent Association of Local Councils
- Kent Fire & Rescue
- Kent Police
- Kent Air Ambulance
- Other Councils
- Public Health
- Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents
- Students
- Teachers
- Transport Consultants and Contractors
- 20s Plenty

### Communication mediums

For the full consultation, the primary method of engagement was digital communications along with advertising, as per KCC's policies. This entailed using social media site Twitter as well as emails and letters being sent out to stakeholder and representative groups.

Paper versions of the consultation and questionnaire were not produced as standard, to limit unnecessary printing and distribution costs, however, as with all

formal consultations, KCC provided documentation and support in alternative formats upon request. This was highlighted on the consultation page for potential respondents.

### **Timescale**

The online public consultation began on 23<sup>rd</sup> of December 2013 and closed on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2014 and featured a detailed questionnaire (**See Appendix 1**) and all relevant documentation including the main Strategy, a question and answer paper, the Equality Impact Assessment and a covering letter from Cabinet Member David Brazier.

### **Coverage**

The Strategy document was downloaded more than 500 times. The other files taken together were downloaded over 300 times. This is encouraging as the level of interest evidences the awareness raising aspect of the consultation.

### **Responses**

In total 66 responses (51 online, 3 Post, 12 email) were received.

32% of respondents were members of the general public rather than partner-agency representatives

## Feedback

It is noteworthy that each of the proposed policy action areas were supported by the majority of respondents, indicating general approval of the approaches and actions contained within the Strategy.

This section includes a summary of the main themes and questions that emerged in the feedback, together with a response. This list is not exhaustive but seeks to address the primary concerns raised by those that responded to the consultation.

### ***Shouldn't have to wait for casualties to happen before something is done***

The Strategy looks to draw information from wider sources than at present to refine how road risk is determined. (See Section 4 and Action 4.2) This new weighting tool seeks to include as much useable information as possible to gather a fuller picture of road safety issues on Kent's road network to prioritise interventions.

### ***Include damage data and listen to residents about where problem areas are***

See above. It is proposed to include information from customer contact databases.

### ***Proactive approach rather than reactive***

See above. It is proposed to use the information to better target engineering and enforcement measures. In addition a strong emphasis is placed on education, training and publicity to influence road user attitudes and behaviours and to promote individual responsibility.

### ***Shouldn't discourage cyclists/pedestrians/riders from using the roads, targets for these road users***

The Strategy proposes setting targets specifically for so-called vulnerable road users (including cyclists and pedestrians). (See Section 5 and Action 5.1) It acknowledges the need to encourage active travel to contribute to healthy lifestyles as part of wider public health objectives. (See Section 3, particularly 3.18) The Council is committed to improving the highway network for cyclists, pedestrians and riders through the provision of segregated routes, through targeted 20mph zones in residential areas, through training schemes such as Bikeability and in campaigns to encourage drivers to be more aware of and accommodating to vulnerable road users. (See Sections 7 and 9)

### ***Improve road environment for all road users, including those not in cars and those with disabilities***

See above. The highway network is used in a wide variety of ways and it needs to be as safe an environment as possible for all users, especially for more vulnerable people and for pedestrians and cyclists.

### ***Importance of road user training***

The Strategy highlights the fact that 76.6% of all crashes occur solely as a result of behavioural factors (driving whilst impaired by drink or drugs, distractions such as a mobile phone or by inappropriate or excessive speed) and 95% of all crashes include an element of human behaviour. Kent County Council delivers a significant programme of Driver Diversionary Courses on behalf of Kent Police and is setting up a new elective course to raise awareness and offer practical driver training. (See Section 7 and Action 7.3)

### ***20mph limits***

The Strategy acknowledges the impact of inappropriate and excess speed on the number and severity of road casualties and well as the impact on residents' quality of life and more vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists. Many casualty reduction initiatives are aimed at reducing inappropriate and excess speed and 20mph limits can be introduced to help achieve lower speeds in this context. The Strategy also proposes further 20mph zones targeted in residential areas to encourage active travel and contribute to wider public health objectives. (See Sections 7, 8 and 9, particularly 9.9 – 9.11)

### ***More active policing and enforcement required***

The Strategy emphasises the need for the County Council to continue to work closely with Kent Police to link education, engineering and engagement initiatives to effective enforcement. The Strategy proposes developing the work around risk to assist the Police to better target enforcement resources. (See Section 8 and Actions A8.1, 8.2 and 8.3)

### ***Investment in maintaining the highway***

The County Council invests substantial resources in highway maintenance, the key arterial routes for commerce and cross county travel being the highest priorities. The Strategy highlights the need to prioritise maintenance of highway safety features including routes, surfaces and some carriageway markings and warning signs where timely action will contribute most to reducing risk. (See Section 9 and Action A9.4)

### ***This policy document is meaningless, supports the “status quo” and is not in plain English.***

In government institutions policy documents lead to decisions over funding and actions. The Strategy outlines work which is already carried out, but it also points to future opportunities and new directions, investigative work and partnership working

which will improve safety on Kent's road network. We have tried to produce a relatively concise and understandable report, but the Strategy does address a complicated topic and as such may occasionally use technical terms. (See Section 1 which provides a summary)

***Needs more direction on actions – how, when and costs. Not just words.***

An Action Plan is appended to the Strategy at Appendix 1. It summarises the measures that will be undertaken in 2014/15, when they will be implemented and the target audience and reach. It is simply not practical to list all current or potential actions by specific areas in a county wide Strategy. However, the County Council does produce district profiles for Community Safety Partnerships each year which sets out specific local area measures, alongside a more detailed Education, Training and Publicity Plan at [www.kentroadsafety.info](http://www.kentroadsafety.info) and engineering and maintenance schemes are reported annually at Joint Transportation Board meetings held bi-monthly at district council offices.

## Equality Analysis

The consultation responses were analysed for Equality relevant feedback using the 'About You' demographic elements of the questionnaire in addition to considering details from the free text comments.

No significant issues were identified in relation to Equality concerns. There were, however, responses which highlighted some of the barriers to access for people with disabilities and the competing concerns of cyclists, pedestrians, mobility assistance users and those with sensory impairments.

Full details of KCC's current understanding of the relevant Equality issues can be found in the Equality Impact Assessment which breaks down the potential impact by the nine Protected Characteristics. Details of both positive and negative impact are included along with appropriate response plans or policy references.

## Next Steps

The policies and actions set out will be implemented subject to the Cabinet Member adopting the Strategy. It is intended that the annual Delivery Action Plan will be reviewed and updated at the end of March each year in line with progress made and in accordance with trends in road safety and casualty data. Engagement and partnership working are key themes in the Strategy and these will result in further communications. Highway engineering schemes will be subject to consultation with local residents and specific highway user groups as appropriate.





## Appendix 1: The Consultation Questionnaire

### Privacy Policy

KCC collects and processes personal information in order to provide a range of public services. KCC respects the privacy of individuals and endeavours to ensure personal information is collected fairly, lawfully, and in compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you wish to know more, or have any concerns about how your information is used, please contact our Information Resilience and Transparency Team ([data.protection@kent.gov.uk](mailto:data.protection@kent.gov.uk)) or ask for a copy of the [full PrivacyNotice](#).

General information about the data protection act can be found on [the Information Commissioner's website](#).

Name

Address

Who do you represent?

A member of the public

Public Health Groups

Kent County Council Member

Insurance industry

Kent County Council Officer

Schools

Highways Agency

A Road User Group (please specify)

Emergency Services

Other (please specify)

KCC Consultants/Contractors

**Having read the draft Road Casualty Reduction Strategy, please answer the following questions;**

**1. Is the content clearly and concisely presented?**      Yes                  No

If not, why?

**2. Of the actions outlined please indicate whether you support each and provide comments if you have any. In this draft Road Casualty Reduction Strategy KCC is proposing to:**

#### ***Policy framework***

A2.1 Prioritise policies and commit/bid for funding for initiatives which will deliver the highest reductions in road casualties, drawing on best practice locally and internationally, within the context of Kent and UK Government Road Safety and Public Health Policy.

Yes                  No                  Comment

#### ***Intelligence and Investigation***

A3.1 Maintain our database of road traffic injuries to monitor short and long term trends within Kent compared to other authorities, to regional data and national data, through the Annual Road Casualties in Kent report as part of Kent's statutory requirements.

Yes No Comment

A3.2 Develop a more refined system of prioritising road casualty reduction interventions across the County, using a wider range of data sources and other research, to determine road risk and to act accordingly to target initiatives.

Yes No Comment

### **Road Casualty Targets**

A4.1 Endorse the targets for a 33% reduction in KSI and a 40% reduction in child KSI by 2020 and to look to set targets based on risk rating of Kent roads (subject to research) including all casualties as well as specifically for pedestrians and pedal cyclists (subject to future trends).

Yes No Comment

### **Education**

A6.1 Continue to prioritise an integrated approach to road safety education, combining education, training and publicity activities, as a key intervention to change road user behaviour and encourage safer road use.

Yes No Comment

A6.2 Produce an annual delivery plan for coordinated education, training and publicity activities, setting out the council's actions and encouraging partners and stakeholders to link with these.

Yes No Comment

A6.3 Continue to deliver National road user training (DDS and Bikeability) in Kent and develop new courses including elective Speed Awareness (HASTE) and adult cycle training.

Yes No Comment

### **Enforcement**

A7.1 Work with Kent Police to improve targeting of enforcement in line with casualty reduction objectives.

Yes No Comment

A7.2 Work with Kent Police to co-ordinate enforcement, education and engineering measures.

Yes No Comment

A7.3 Work with Kent Police to support initiatives with local communities.

Yes	No	Comment
-----	----	---------

### **Engineering**

A8.1 Continue to implement a Crash Remedial Measure (CRM) programme at locations with the highest crash frequencies where engineering measures will prevent their outcome in the future.

Yes No Comment

A8.2 Develop the CRM programme to take account of non-personal injury crash data and other risk factors identified by research.

Yes No Comment

A8.3 Ensure all highway engineering schemes are designed to the relevant standards and that they undergo the appropriate safety audit/assessment as required by the county's policy.

Yes No Comment

A8.4 Carry out regular safety inspections to identify and rectify quickly any defects likely to create danger to users of the highway network.

Yes No Comment

### **Engagement and partnership working**

A9.1 Work closely with all partners and stakeholders to ensure casualty reduction is tackled using all the tools available and use the most appropriate solution to the identified problem be that engineering, education or enforcement or a combination of all three.

Yes No Comment

A9.2 Continue to actively support the Kent and Medway Casualty Reduction Partnership (CaRe) work as well as other partnerships to co-ordinate initiatives.

Yes No Comment

A9.3 Embed road safety as part of the County Councils One Council culture in particular with public health, education and communities departments.

Yes No Comment

A9.4 Enhance engagement with local media and Kent residents and provide information and 'self-help' tools to enable communities to promote road safety in local areas.

Yes No Comment

### **Funding**

A10.1 Sustain and prioritise spending on road casualty reduction initiatives and develop bids to government and the private sector as opportunities arise.

Yes No Comment

**3. Do you think we should have any additional actions?**

Yes No Comment

**4. Do you support the proposed Outcomes Framework?**

Yes No Comment

**5. The Strategy is focused on reducing the most serious road casualties, are there any other road safety issues which you feel have not been adequately addressed? What are they and how should Kent County Council tackle them?**

Comment

**About you**

We want to make sure that everyone is treated fairly and equally, and that no one gets left out. To help us we are asking you for some information about yourself. This information will only be used to help us make decisions about our services and for the purposes of service improvement.

If you would rather not answer any of these questions, you do not have to, but please go to the bottom of this page and click on 'submit' to ensure that we receive your previous answers.

Are you?

Male

Female

Prefer not to say

How old are you?

Under 20

20-25

26-30

31-35

36-40

41-45

46-50

Over 50

I prefer not to say

**The Equality Act 2010 describes a person as disabled if they have a longstanding physical or mental condition that has lasted, or is likely to last, at least 12 months; and this condition has a substantial adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. People with some conditions (cancer, multiple sclerosis and HIV/AIDS, for example), are considered to be disabled from the point that they are diagnosed.**

Do you consider yourself to be disabled as set out in the Equality Act 2010?  
Please tell us which type of impairment applies to you.

Physical impairment

Mental health condition

Sensory impairment (hearing, sight or both)

Learning disability

Long standing illness or health condition (such as cancer, HIV/AIDS, heart disease, diabetes or epilepsy)

Other (please specify)

I prefer not to say

## Appendix 2: A selection of quotes from the consultation responses

“Educating people that reducing speed limits is not the answer to road safety”

“The most important outcome is to increase the usability of all roads for ALL potential users - especially non-vehicular users”

“Spending on off-road paths for walkers, cyclists and equestrians increases safety and encourages healthy exercise and recreation at far less cost than most road schemes”

“Don't wait for deaths before taking any action”

“I am appalled that this Draft Strategy presents no policies for supporting and encouraging the use of public transport as means of reducing traffic and hence reducing casualties.”

“Avoid random speed restrictions on roads that are not endorsed by the police and which are not enforceable.”

“Ask local people - don't expect them to tell you, you must ASK”

“a charming document and beautifully illustrated another 'must do' box ticked. Unfortunately even these fine words didn't butter the parsnips. I see no relevance to our locality in terms of planned achievements.”

“It is almost impossible to disagree with anything in this document.”

“I think the proposed strategy is really well presented, ambitious and exciting.”

“It would be good to see the Council give a higher priority to the use of all roads by pedestrians and cyclists”

“Given that the evidence shows 95% of accidents are due to driver error / behaviour and only 7% the environment. Granted probably, engineering costs are more expensive and therefore scope to do a lot less. What would happen if 75% of the budget was given to education? Would we see a much bigger return for our money in accident reduction?”

“Public Health supports using a system of integrated intelligence (whole system intelligence). This would enable the improved design of frameworks to evaluate the impact of road safety interventions on all health and social care services over time, by integrating the information systems of various health, social care, and other organisations and departments.”

“KCC need to support Kent Police more and Kent Police need to support KCC more.”

“More police on the streets to enforce road traffic laws and improve compliance”

“A lot of communities want speed cameras, traffic calming, 20mph down THEIR road, but are not so keen when driving down somebody else's road! Pandering to these hypocrites might gain a few votes for councillors at the next parish election, but to have these hypocrites setting speed limits on our NATIONAL road system is a travesty and is all part of the wider plan to restrict car travel.”

“Collaboration is the way forward”

“Good policy - will you actually do it?”

“A total re-think is needed on funding. It needs to be targeted at overall road safety and not just the flawed crash reduction schemes.”

“Kent County Council needs to strongly consider expanding 20MPH speed limits in some of its roads, especially outside schools and near residential areas that have very a very small distance between the road and front doors.”

“This policy review should not proceed on the current narrow basis. KCC should go back to the drawing board and review all aspects of road safety, not just casualty reduction, in line with its statutory obligations.”

“The Town Council would request that this policy is expanded to include a commitment for KCC to support other bodies in bidding for funds where the initiatives seeking funding would be in line with aims of road casualty reduction strategy.”

“In rural villages we would welcome the use of including "Residents Perceptions", but suggest that these should be surveys carried out by Parish Councils and fed into the database as well.”

“Non-motorised users (walkers, cyclists, horse riders and horse-drawn carriage drivers) progressively avoid roads as they become more dangerous so statistics showing reduced accidents may only reflect reduced use and suppressed demand”

“I think you can get bogged down in statistics - they can only tell you so much”

“The action to better determine the risk of a road casualty occurring in the future and the possible use of a database to establish the number of road safety related issues recorded along a route will be welcomed by communities as public perception of what is happening on the ground is not collected.”

“Education is great, but the priority should be to put in speed limits, enforcement and other measures to calm traffic.”

“Aspirations are all very well, but concrete evidence needs to form the basis of any Strategy.”

“Casualty reduction cannot be left to the police. Once again experience has shown they fail to address the needs of vulnerable users”

“Kent Police have an extremely poor attitude to "local communities", and KCC are not much better. Please show us some evidence of such initiatives.”

“Local communities have the best knowledge of their local roads. Dangerous junctions and roads are obvious to local every day users even if at any one time statistics do not appear to support such views”

“The Strategy does not include any mechanism for developing local volunteer involvement. The supply of free, dedicated labour is not inexhaustible.”

“This is an extremely important area with continuing budget reductions and fewer officers on the ground, Parish Councils are working very hard to join together with all agencies to work together to come up with ways in which to reduce excessive speeding, anti-social



and obstructive parking. Unfortunately, without police input residents perception of how Councils are tackling these issues continues to give cause for concern. “

“Engineering is best when preventative rather than reactive”

“Ideally one should be trying to avoid anyone getting hurt in the first place. Particularly if cheap, simple actions such as a bit of white paint could make a big difference.”

“Like most of these points - stating the bleeding obvious”

“While this body (CaRe) may do valuable work, it is little known and its existence, aims and objectives are not known by the wider public.”

“Better, integrated public transport to take people out of cars”

“Lorries (especially heavy, continental ones) are the "elephant in the room". The extent of their involvement in accidents should be closely documented, education should be Europe-wide and use of laybys on trunk roads as overnight stops should be discouraged on safety grounds.”

“Less lip-service, more action”

“Road safety issues must be assessed in large development projects and given a higher priority at planning stage.”