Scrutiny Review
Barking and Dagenham Safer & Stronger Community Select Committee
May 2013 – January 2014

Review on how the Council manages parking and traffic measures to improve road safety
People should be safe when travelling around their communities. Accidents that cause injury or death can be avoided by engineering out risk on the roads and highways, taking enforcement action against individuals who are a danger to others, and educating users of roads and highways about the need to travel safely and be mindful of others. The Council is determined in making the borough safer but we also need every driver and pedestrian to play their part by having the right attitudes and behaviours when on our roads.

Recently there have been too many tragedies on London’s roads and following several deaths of cyclists towards the end of 2013 we feel this review is important and timely to reinforce messages about road safety. During the course of the review the Select Committee found much good practice and a strong commitment from responsible authorities to keep Barking and Dagenham’s residents safe on the roads. However, lines of accountability and responsibility for the road safety agenda as a whole are not cohesive or clearly led. We therefore believe that the various threads of road safety initiatives need to be tied together into a single borough owned strategy.

I would like to thank everyone who contributed to the review but especially representatives from Sustrans who showed us the value of engaging with neighbourhoods to confront their traffic and public realm problems. Solutions to road safety issues do not have to be expensive, simple measures can make a big difference, make neighbourhoods better places to live, and ultimately save lives.

Cllr. Margaret Mullane  
Chair, Safer and Stronger Community Select Committee
1 Executive Summary

The SSCSC undertook a scrutiny review on the effectiveness of parking and traffic flow measures and their effectiveness in improving road safety. The review was structured under three headings, Enforcement, Engineering and Education:

- Enforcement – establishing restrictions on the highway network for motorists, such as 20mph zones, which the Council and /or the Police van then monitor and issue penalties against to deter further dangerous driving.
- Engineering – decisions to carry out physical interventions to the highway network such as implementing speed humps, chicanes etc. to slow vehicles down and deter dangerous driving or to support deterrents such as speed zones.
- Education – plan and deliver communication campaigns targeted at specific groups to promote road safety messages to warn and to give advice.

The scrutiny process for the review took place between May 2013 and January 2014, with Members drawing information from a wide range of sources to gain an in depth understanding of how the road safety function works within itself and the context of the Council, and how it interacts with partner agencies and stakeholders.

2 Recommendations

A number of proposals were suggested throughout the scrutiny process, and these have been collated to form the following recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends supporting an ongoing programme of 20mph zones in residential streets borough wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends Parking Services Group introduces tasking arrangements for the enforcement of all moving traffic violations where there is an engineered solution in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends a programme of installing and enforcing parking restrictions to all roads with cycle lanes where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends that all new local parking plans should identify traffic calming and road safety improvements as part of each schemes business case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends the implementation of the Highways Asset Management Plan as part of its overall road safety strategy and scheme inventory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends supporting a programme to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>double yellow lines at all junctions and pinch points and a review of existing safety lineage borough wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends that the Council identifies annual funding for a capital programme of road safety schemes linked to a road safety strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends supporting the Safe Drive Stay Alive Campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends a devising a borough Road Safety Strategy. This should pull together the borough’s overall approach and priorities for road safety under the headings of Enforcement, Engineering and Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends a lead officer to co-ordinate delivery of the Road Safety Strategy at Divisional Director level. The Select Committee suggests that under the current arrangements and designated areas of responsibility that the Divisional Director of Environment and Enforcement Services is identified as that lead officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends supporting the actions arising from the School Summit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends supporting a more inclusive methodology for resident engagement on new road safety schemes &amp; localised parking schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends an annual report is brought to the Community Safety Partnership to show progress against the Road Safety Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Select Committee recommends an update report on the Road Safety Improvement Implementation Plan is brought to the SSCSC in July 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Introduction

3.1 Membership of the SSCSC
The SSCSC consisted of the following nine Councillors in the 2013-14 municipal year:

- Councillor M Mullane (Chair)
- Councillor A Salam (Deputy Chair)
- Councillor S J Bremner
- Councillor P Burgon
- Councillor I S Jamu
- Councillor M McKenzie MBE
- Councillor D S Miles
- Councillor E O Obasohan
- Councillor T Perry

Anne Bristow, the Corporate Director of Adult and Community Services, nominated as the SSCSC Scrutiny Champion, supported the Select Committee throughout the review and provided expertise and guidance to the Select Committee.

Officer support was provided by Robin Payne, Divisional Director of Environment, Ruth Du-Lieu, Highways and Environmental Design Service Manager, Daniel Connelly, Highways, Parking and Traffic Officer, Dan Pope, Group Manager for Development and Regeneration, Timothy Martin, Transportation, Planning & Policy Manager.

Expert evidence was also taken from Martin Young Police Traffic Management Liaison Officer, Andy Beckingham LBBD Public Health Consultant, Paul McClenaghan Station Manager of Fire and Emergency Services in Barking and Dagenham, Paul Jeffrey (London Ambulance Service), Peter Sadler (Transport for London), and Ben Addy (Sustrans).

The Highways and Environmental Design Team collated the evidence from all sessions outlined in the Methodology section, which formed the basis of this Report.
3.2 Terms of reference
The Select Committee proposed that, in order to assess the mechanisms in place to improve road safety, the following should be considered during its review:

- Where are our calming measures, and how do they operate.
- What evidence do we have of road safety and driving behaviours at these locations.
- What are the views of various stakeholder groups.
- How do other forms of traffic management impact on road safety.
- Are there relative benefits from alternatives – e.g. 20 mph zones.
- How can we use localised parking planning to support road safety measures.
- What are future funding opportunities and need.

3.3 Methodology
Over the course of the review, the Select Committee met for formal meetings and also carried out a site visit to the recently developed Hornchurch Town Centre. The Council hosted a School Summit in which Members, schools, partner agencies and Council departments debated the road safety issues specific to schools. During the course of the review the Select Committee Members have been presented with and considered, a great deal of information about road safety throughout Barking and Dagenham. A consultation exercise was undertaken with key internal and external stakeholders including TFL, The London Fire Brigade, London Ambulance Service, Sustrans, the Metropolitan Police, Highways, Transportation, Planning and Policy.

The information collated to inform the review has been sourced through the following channels:

- Desktop research.
- A presentation from the Divisional Director for Environment on the Councils approach to Road Safety.
- A presentation on the Local Implementation Plan.
4 Background

4.1 The Role of the Council in addressing Road Safety

Local Authorities have a statutory duty to provide Road Safety. Section 39 of the Road Traffic Act (RTA) 1988 (as amended by the RTA 1991) places a statutory responsibility for road safety on local authorities. The act requires local authorities to prepare and carry out a programme of measures designed to promote road safety and enable a contribution to be made towards the cost of promoting road safety measures.

The Act states local authorities must:
- carry out studies into accidents arising out of the use of vehicles on roads or part of roads, other than trunk roads, within their area,
- in the light of those studies, take such measures as appear to the authority to be appropriate to prevent such accidents, including the dissemination of information and advice relating to the use of the roads, the giving of practical training to road users or any class or description of road users, the construction, improvement, maintenance or repair of roads for which they are the highway authority and other measures taken in the exercise of their powers for controlling, protecting or assisting the movement of traffic on roads
- in constructing new roads, must take such measures as appear to the authority to be appropriate to reduce the possibilities of such accidents when the roads come into use.

Road Safety provision by local authorities should identify, develop and deliver solutions to problems. This may be through educational programmes, skills training e.g. cyclist and young driver training, and publicity campaigns and programmes to inform, raise awareness and to encourage positive and discourage negative behaviours by road users. Road safety professionals should also inform planning and development design and to provide advice on policies and protocols that will improve road safety and design out potential hazards.

Local Authorities, acting as the Highways Authority, should also have road safety engineers who seek to identify and implement road design and engineering solutions to road casualty problems in their areas. The road safety education and engineering teams should work together, as well as in co-operation with other agencies, such as the Police, London Fire Brigade.

Local authorities also have a duty to manage and maintain their road networks under section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. It is the duty of a local authority to
manage their road network with a view to achieving expeditious movement of traffic on the authority’s road network.

4.2 The role of central government in Road Safety

Central government sets the regulatory framework for roads, vehicles and road users, and the country’s national Road Safety Strategy. This includes:

- Providing funding and resources to local government and others to enable the delivery of road safety.
- Collecting and publishing road casualty data.
- Setting standards for road design, construction and maintenance.
- Setting standards for vehicles and requirements for vehicle licensing.
- Managing the motorways and trunk road network.
- Commissioning research into the nature, causes of and potential solutions to, road casualties.
- Conducting education and publicity campaigns.
- Setting requirements for driver licensing training and tests.
- Setting road use laws, including offences and penalties, and guidance on safe road use, such as the Highway Code.

The Government’s Strategic Framework for Road Safety does not set casualty reduction targets, but instead forecasts that road deaths will fall to between 1,770 and 1,530 by 2020.

The Strategic Framework for Road Safety also reflects the Government’s overall policy of ‘Localism’, which aims to allow local authorities and local citizens to decide their own priorities for road safety in their areas, and to link their road safety agendas with other local agendas, such as public health and sustainable travel.

Central government supports this by providing access to guidance and information to the public and to road safety professionals. Access to information and data on road safety can be located on the ROSPA web site [www.rospa.com](http://www.rospa.com)
5 Barking and Dagenham approach to Road Safety

5.1. Barking and Dagenham’s road safety record

The latest figures comparing road traffic collisions for London (2011) show that the borough has the eighth lowest number of accidents out of the 33 London Boroughs.

In 2012 the number of fatal accidents in the borough is as low as it has been in the past five years with two reported fatal accidents compared with eight fatal accidents in 2008.

For cyclist the position is more mixed. The table below shows the number of reported collisions in one or more pedal cyclist being injured from 2000 to 2012 (latest full year available) show that lowest levels were in the years 2003, 2007, 2008 and 2009. Encouragingly in 2012 the number of pedal cyclist casualties is lower than in the two previous years of 2010, 2011.

Table 1 - Collisions resulting in one or more pedal cyclist casualty in LBBD from 2000 to 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1 Fatal</th>
<th>2 Serious</th>
<th>3 Slight</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2. Who is responsible for road safety in Barking & Dagenham?

The provision of road safety falls to several different areas of the Council.

**Transportation, Planning & Policy**

The Transportation, Planning and Policy team develop and manage the Local Implementation Plan (LIP). The second Local Implementation Plan (LIP2) has now been published. It outlines the strategies and measures that will form the basis for the delivery of improvements to the transport network in Barking and Dagenham over the next three years.

The LIP includes a number of contributions to road safety and ‘improving road safety conditions’ is one of the 10 LIP2 objectives. Key contributions relate to cycling safety, safety and security measures, traffic management, and highways and public realm enhancement.

**Improving safety and security:** implementing/upgrading road crossings; introduction of CCTV cameras; improving street lighting; introducing vehicle-activated signs; undertaking road safety education and training; introduction of innovative traffic calming measures, introduction of home zones and roll out of additional 20 mph zones;

The LIP is granted funded from central government via TFL. Delivery of schemes is monitored through the LIP programme board chaired by the Divisional Director for Regeneration. The LIP Delivery Plan for 2014/15 – 2016/17 includes funding for small number of comprehensive highway improvement projects, an increased annual road safety allocation, further cycle training and school travel plans.

**Environmental Services**

The management of the boroughs highway and traffic network falls to the Environmental Services division. The teams here oversee the network management duties, reactive and planned road maintenance, delivery of school crossing patrols, and the consultation, design and engineering of road safety schemes.

They are responsible for investigating road safety issues and incidents and putting in place solutions to road safety problems. They work closely with the police and TFL to monitor and reduce accidents and respond to serious incidents and fatalities.
Delivery of road safety schemes are partly funded through the LIP. In LIP2 the annual sum of £200,000 has been allocated for road safety schemes from 2014/15, which is an effective doubling on road safety through the LIP.

Each year the Highways Board, chaired by the Divisional Director for Environmental Services, decides which schemes to fund from the programme using the allocation of LIP funding. There is insufficient LIP funding to initiate all schemes and therefore some are left on the programme unfunded. Where there is a serious incident or fatality, or any other urgent measure, the reactive highways budget (General Fund) is used to put in place any safety measures required. This budget is also used to fund the provision of road lines and signs for safety as there is separate no budget allocated.

Where capital for Highways investment allows for major road repairs the service will cost in minor road safety features such as road markings or speed humps, but the area basis of this investment limits where such improvements can not be undertaken across the borough.

Where new localised parking plans are agreed, the service will use the Traffic Management Order to include parking restrictions that will benefit road safety. This could include the placement of bays, double yellow lines at junctions or single direction traffic. An agreed capital programme is in place from 2014 to fund new localised parking schemes from the revenue generated by parking plans.

Parking enforcement is delivered by this Division and this includes some decriminalised moving traffic offences, but not speeding.

**Community Safety Partnership**

In addition, the Council also chairs the Community Safety Partnership (CSP). By working openly and closely across organisations, the CSP aims to develop and implement safety solutions which help to meet the Community Plan priorities. Following the last Strategic Assessment of Crime and Disorder, the crime priorities include improving road safety. This is chaired by the Corporate Director of Adult and Community Services.

**Recommendation 8**
The Select Committee recommends that the Council identifies annual funding for a capital programme of road safety schemes linked to a road safety strategy.

**Recommendation 10**
The Select Committee recommends a devising a borough Road Safety Strategy. This should pull together the borough’s overall approach and priorities for road safety under the headings of Enforcement, Engineering and Education.
**Recommendation 11**
The Select Committee recommends a lead officer to co-ordinate delivery of the Road Safety Strategy at Divisional Director level. The Select Committee suggests that under the current arrangements and designated areas of responsibility that the Divisional Director of Environment and Enforcement Services is identified as that lead officer.

**Recommendation 14**
The Select Committee recommends an annual report is brought to the Community Safety Partnership to show progress against the Road Safety Strategy.

### 5.3. Consultation & Engagement

All road safety schemes are designed with input from residents and if appropriate local businesses. The idea or rationale for a scheme will usually be driven by residents who are concerned at the safety of a road or footway or following an accident. In the case of LIP schemes these usually cover a much wider area and are aimed at generally improving the safety, look and feel of the public realm.

The usual method for consultation is on road safety and localised parking schemes are to write to those affected explaining the proposal and supplying a drawing. Comments are invited and dependant on the feelings expressed schemes may be changed or are progressed to implementation stage which in most cases involves securing a traffic order and therefore formal statutory consultation is undertaken. In the more contentious schemes ward Members will often call a public meeting to discuss the scheme and agree a final design.

In most cases, residents and the Council reach a consensus on the need and design of a scheme. This is often harder with localised parking schemes where residents are often against the idea of restricting spaces and possible charging for controlled parking zones. This sometimes stems from the Council not being clear in its communications on the need for the scheme i.e. to improve road safety and this can lead to assumptions being made about the motives especially if the scheme results in the Council raising extra revenue. Although most members of the public can see the rationale for road safety schemes such as pedestrian crossings they see less merit in placing double yellow lines at junctions and will often oppose such moves as it affects their ability to park.

In the case of LIP schemes, as these tend to cover a larger area and group of consultees and represent more of an investment, consultation is on a much larger scale often using surveys, ideas forums and public events often carried out with the external architects and design agencies.

The Select Committee heard from Sustrans as part of the reviews consultation with stakeholders. Sustrans are sustainable transportation charity who works with Local
Authorities and transport bodies to develop strategy and vision for the delivery of cycling, walking and sustainable travel changes. They demonstrated an innovative approach to scheme design. They engage with the public from the start, involving them at the concept stage, looking at the problems before even thinking about the solutions. Sustrans use a two way consultation method i.e. they encourage those affected to attend street meetings, design days and entice people in with the offer of refreshments, entertainment for children etc. The approach is one of community cohesion in design; getting neighbourhoods to come together to discuss problems and come up with ideas they can all agree on. There is a degree of professional advice used to steer the planning and design. The result is greater ownership of the schemes.

One of the issues with parking plans and smaller scheme design is being able to engage with residents and businesses in the first place. The main method used of writing out to residents is one way consultation as there can be no discussion or explanation. Often results show that only a small percentage of those asked actually respond with opinions and comments. This can lead to challenge once the scheme is in place and even may result in schemes being altered or withdrawn.

**Recommendation 13**
The Select Committee recommends supporting a more inclusive methodology for resident engagement on new road safety schemes & localised parking schemes.

**Recommendation 4**
The Select Committee recommends that all new local parking plans should identify traffic calming and road safety improvements as part of each schemes business case.

### 5.4. Effectiveness of road safety schemes

The Select Committee was supplied details of all the engineering that has taken place to improve road safety in previous years. All of these interventions e.g. speed humps, chicanes, crossings, 20mph zones etc., are part of the highways asset. The Council is currently developing a Highways Asset Management Plan (HAMP) which will ensure these and other highways assets are maintained properly and their effectiveness is reviewed.

**Recommendation 5**
The Select Committee recommends the implementation of the Highways Asset Management Plan as part of its overall road safety strategy and scheme inventory.

The Select Committee chose a number of schemes to review and assess the effectiveness of the different types of engineering interventions. These included a busy light controlled junction, a chicane and similar location without engineered traffic calming.
It was noted that within the review, resources for the review of scheme effectiveness was limited and any future reviews will need to have capacity and technology available. However, evidence reported did reveal that

- Average speed in chicanes was above the level expected and not significantly different to roads without engineered control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey results with traffic calming (max 30mph)</td>
<td>21.1mph</td>
<td>20.7mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey results with no speed restrictions (max 30mph)</td>
<td>20.2mph</td>
<td>21.2mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Speed survey carried out between 8th and 14th October 2013

- Accident data per location below serious collision is not easily retrievable
- Right hand turns at light controlled junctions requires more investigation to establish volumes and impact on non serious collisions.

**Recommendation 7**

The Select Committee recommends that the Highways and Environmental Design Service establishes a clear process for ensuring the road safety benefits of all new and existing highway schemes are identified and capable of being reviewed.

The Select Committee heard from the Metropolitan Police traffic division who explained the police priorities and how they have limited resources to enforce 20mph zones. Such zones, the Police advised must be supported by an engineering solution such as speed humps to be an effective deterrent. The London Ambulance Service (LAS) spoke to the Select Committee and were keen to stress the negative effect engineered solutions can have on their ability to respond to 999 calls i.e. slowing down for speed humps etc.

A site visit was undertaken to view the road safety improvements made to Hornchurch Town Centre. Select Committee Members general consensus was that the scheme had improved road safety both physically and in terms of perception. The design included narrowing of carriageways, raised tables and build outs, 20mph zone & central crossing islands to reduce speed, controlled pedestrian crossing points, widened footpaths & removal of street furniture / railings.

The Select Committee received evidence that a study of a number of 20 mph zones in London has shown them to have delivered a 42 per cent reduction in all casualties
and a 53 per cent reduction in Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI) casualties. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents (RoSPA) also show that studies of pedestrian injury and car impact speed found that at 20mph there was a 2.5% chance of being fatally injured, compared to a 20% chance at 30mph.

Whilst recognising the limited preparedness of the police to enforce 20mph restrictions; and the limitation of funding to deliver engineered solutions; there was strong support for the Council’s current stated policy of rolling out 20mph zones where we can. It was noted that there was little evidence to show that moving traffic offences for giving way to oncoming traffic associated with chicanes are being enforced routinely.

**Recommendation 1**
The Select Committee recommends supporting an ongoing programme of 20mph zones in residential streets borough wide.

**Recommendation 2**
The Select Committee recommends Parking Services Group introduces tasking arrangements for the enforcement of all moving traffic violations where there is an engineered solution in place.

**Recommendation 6**
The Select Committee recommends supporting a programme to implement double yellow lines at all junctions and pinch points and a review of existing safety lineage borough wide.

### 5.5. Effectiveness of road safety education

The Select Committee heard from the London Fire Brigade (LFB) about the Safe Drive Stay Alive Campaign. The Station Manager from Dagenham Fire Station explained how he is working with the Council and partner agencies such as TFL, London Ambulance Service etc., to produce the second weeklong event in March 2014 for year 11 school children. Safe Drive Stay Alive shows children through videos, presentations and demonstrations the dangers on the road for them as pedestrians and as young drivers.

The Transport, Planning and Policy team explained the road safety education that is taking place in schools through the Green Travel planning targeting primary school.

This theme was expanded upon with the event held in October, the School Summit. The Council drew together representatives from schools, elected Members, partner agencies and Council departments to discuss and debate road safety issues around schools and the routes into schools. The Summit concluded with a number of ideas and initiatives that all stakeholders supported including the establishment of a steering group. There are now five projects being developed by this group to improve safety around schools.
1. Pilot project to share the cost of enforcement between 5 schools & assess the effectiveness to inform a larger project

2. Educational poster campaign led by senior school children as part of their studies aimed at primary school children.

3. The production of a video for new primary school children’s parents and carers’ promoting road safety.

4. A feasibility study into having ‘school zones’ for dropping off or short term parking where children cannot walk to school any other way.

5. A scheme to investigate working with local businesses to provide parking capacity and drop off points for local schools

**Recommendation 9**
The Select Committee recommends supporting the Safe Drive Stay Alive Campaign.

**Recommendation 12**
The Select Committee recommends supporting the actions arising from the School Summit

### 5.6. General views from stakeholders

The Select Committee heard from a number of other stakeholders during the review. The London Ambulance Service (LAS) and TFL both highlighted the Mayor for London’s new targets in the Safety Action Plan around reducing the statistics for KSI’s (Killed or Seriously Injured) casualties by 40% by 2020. These are reflected in the LIP targets.

The biggest challenge identified within the plan was reducing the number of KSI casualties classified as vulnerable road users which includes motorcyclists, pedal cyclist and pedestrians. Whereas the number of other road user groups such as car occupant is having a faster KSI reduction. The age group of 15-19 and 20 – 24 still remain the estimated “at risk” groups with more casualties from these age groups than any other.

A representative group of residents also addressed the Select Committee and were invited to give their opinions on the approach to road safety in Barking & Dagenham.

**Recommendation 3**
The Select Committee recommends a programme of installing and enforcing parking restrictions to all roads with cycle lanes where possible.

### 5.7. Financial Implications

At this stage, there are no financial implications identified. This report however, proposes various recommendations which would have cost implications. The
implementation plan attached also identifies proposed funding sources. Once costs against the recommendations are determined, funding sources can be confirmed and impact on Council funding identified.