

DEVON AND CORNWALL CONSTABULARY

DEVON & CORNWALL SAFETY CAMERA UNIT EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE STEERING GROUP

Held at: Moorland Links Hotel, Yelverton on Friday 20th January 2006

Chairman: Superintendent Tim SWARBRICK

Secretary: *****

Attended by:	Jon FARR	Safety Camera Partnership
	Richard PRYCE	Devon & Cornwall Constabulary
	Chris EASTWOOD	Devon & Cornwall Constabulary
	*****	Torbay Council
	Peter GIMBER	Devon County Council
	Nigel DYSON	Highways Agency
	Adrian TRIM	Plymouth City Council
	*****	Devon & Cornwall Constabulary
	*****	Department for Transport
	*****	Devon County Council
	Natalie HATSWELL	Safety Camera Partnership
	Peter EDWARDS	HMCS Plymouth Magistrates Court FPO
	Peter MOORE	Cornwall County Council
	Ian PEARNE	Cornwall County Council
	Patrick CARNEY	Torbay Council
Apologies:	Kathy TAYLOR	Crown Prosecution Service
	Emma TAYLOR	
	Danny BATTEN	Devon & Cornwall Magistrates

Item No	Discussion	For Action By
1.	<p><u>Welcome</u></p> <p>Supt SWARBRICK opened the meeting and welcomed all those present. He confirmed the interest expressed by all partners for this project to continue but that there was a need for clarification.</p> <p>Jon FARR outlined the agenda and format for the day.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Minutes of the meeting on 5th December 2005</u></p> <p>It was agreed to address these at the next Steering Group Meeting.</p>	

Item No	Discussion	For Action By
3.	<p><u>Urgent Matters</u> (1) Starcross Jon FARR gave an update on the current position from the point of view of the SCP back office. All consequential loss claims have been referred to Devon County Council insurers. The content of the letter sent to all those with paid conditional offers was discussed and it was confirmed that legal advice was sought before constructing.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Discussion of the key issues resulting from the Secretary of State's announcement</u> Jon FARR introduced *****, the Programme Assurance Officer who supports this and 9 other partnerships.</p> <p>The announcement followed the 4th year report when the Secretary of State made a decision that netting-off would cease. ***** explained that she had hoped she could give some clarification on how the funding would be agreed but that was not yet available. However, guidelines for the LTP will be out early next week. It is hoped that the new scheme will give greater flexibility of operation and will be integrated into normal business. The LTP process can move into a wider arena.</p> <p>***** gave her view of the funding allocation and pointed out that any authority that produces a good quality bid can increase their funding but it will be assessed across the whole plan.</p> <p>Questions were raised surrounding any requirements relating to the enforcement and offence levels, and it was stated there was no formal link.</p> <p>Concern was also expressed about the investment in staff and equipment and the future liability of redundancies.</p> <p>The possibility of introducing local needs was discussed and the possibility of adopting the national guidelines with some local amendments.</p>	

Item No	Discussion	For Action By
---------	------------	---------------

It was felt that all Local Transport Planners should work together to get a common framework but it was noted that this would need a mandate from the executive bodies.

Tim SWARBRICK felt there was a need to have reassurance as a partnership and commitment from authorities and agencies that safety cameras will be supported in the future.

It was agreed at this stage that each authority would need to state their on-going commitment to the Partnership in their LTP.

It was also noted that volumes could vary which would cause a problem for the Fixed Penalty Office and the Police, and neither would be part of the planning process.

***** gave an overview of his financial involvement and outlined the current situation of cost recovery.

It was suggested that one lead authority should take this on.

Following discussion it was agreed that all authorities, highways agencies and the magistrates court should identity a financial manager to discuss this aspect with ***, nominations to be e-mailed to Jon FARR.**

ALL

***** continued by giving an overview of how the current funding for LTP works. He stressed that there were numerous checks in place within the TLP process to assess local authority spending as well as targets, which were reviewed. He felt the local transport plans needed commonality and there would be a need to ensure consistency through any political changes.

The need for the local transport plans to have a common message and statement of support was discussed.

Comments were sought from all authorities who were at various stages of the submission of the plan.

The question was raised that with four local

Item No	Discussion	For Action By
	<p>authorities would the cost and benefit be proportional to the activity in each of those areas. Having a formula for calculating this was discussed.</p> <p>***** agreed to co-ordinate with all parties to add appropriate text or paragraph.</p>	<p>*****</p>
5.	<p><u>Feedback from Project Managers Meeting and update on guidance for future funding</u></p> <p>Jon FARR gave a presentation outlining the success of the partnership to date with some supportive data. He outlined some key issues from the announcement which would need further discussion and consideration.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Consideration of possible models of future operation of safety camera activity</u></p> <p>Jon FARR outlined the following choices:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Reduced camera operationB. Minimum changeC. Minimum change and innovationD. Police/magistrates service provisionE. Separate authority approach <p>The pros and cons of each scenario were outlined followed by attendees breaking into two groups to discuss the options further.</p>	
7.	<p><u>Favoured Options Identified</u></p> <p>On returning to the main meeting, group 1 outlined their thoughts. Option A was ruled out, as it had been proven that cameras work it would be foolish to stop enforcement altogether. This group favoured a B+ option identifying a basic level of enforcement activity with options for additional services. Group B were in broad agreement.</p>	
8.	<p><u>Key Concerns</u></p> <p>The two groups raised the following concerns:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Move need to be a managed transition to the new way of working.• End goals/levels of activity need to be clearly identified for discussion with partners.	

Item No	Discussion	For Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It was discussed in broad terms the programme would deliver casualty reduction, speed reduction and proportionate levels of enforcement.• Need a 4 year business plan with outcome to 2011.• Need one partner to be agreed as banker for the project.• Need to engage local groups in a regional approach (such as SCOTS).• Define the “minimum level” of activity to be carried out and funded.• Need to understand what’s after 2010.• Exit costs need to be identified with managed approach.• Road Safety Bill impacts needs to be assessed.• Politics – ensuring parochial attitudes do not undermine effectiveness.• The formula – payment levels for each authority and how this might work needs to be identified.	
9.	<p><u>Difficulties</u> Members broke into two discussion to define the following difficulties:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What service level is delivered for the agreed funding?• Demand outstrips supply for enforcement services or vice versa.• Agreed level of activity – mechanisms for adjustments to be worked in to delivery.• How do we deal with any new or existing liabilities from funded prosecutions?• Should D & C SCP be a PLC? (limit of liability)• One body/person as treasurer, how would this work.	
9.	<p><u>Actions</u> The following actions had been identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ***** to develop a template of words for LTP, including a statement on commitment to Safety Camera enforcement and regional partnership working.• Commercial agreement securing/defining	

Item No	Discussion	For Action By
---------	------------	---------------

funds (binding) to be developed.

- Financial representative to work on the development of business plan and cost models.
- Define the detail of the favoured option.
- Highways Authority position of funding corporately to be established.
- Central co-ordination assumed any dissent from this now needs to be identified early.
- Cost structure recovery model needs to be identified.
- ***** agreed to co-ordinate with all parties to add text/para into LTP's.

Editor's Note

For the purpose of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, a small amount of information may have been redacted from these minutes where they qualify for exemption under the Act. These are denoted by the symbols *****. These exemptions include; 'Personal Data' – Section 40 – where names, or personal information relating to private individuals and non-members of the Partnership Steering Group, are withheld; 'Law Enforcement' – Section 31 – where information may prejudice the prevention and detection of crime or the apprehension and prosecution of offenders; 'Investigations and Proceedings' – Section 30 – where information relates to an ongoing investigation or criminal proceedings; 'Health and Safety' – Section 38 – where the health or safety of Partnership staff, or assets, may be endangered; 'Commercial Interests' – Section 43 – where information may prejudice the commercial interests of any person.