

Adult Social Care and Communities Scrutiny Committee

Tuesday 29 October 2019 at 10.00 am

Meeting Room 1&2 - Shire Hall, Gloucester



AGENDA

ORGANISATION ITEMS

1	APOLOGIES	Stephen Bace
2	MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 1 - 10)	Stephen Bace
3	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	Stephen Bace

SCRUTINY ITEMS

4	<p>ROAD SAFETY (Pages 11 - 14)</p> <p><i>This council notes that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>road safety and traffic speeds are of significant concern to many residents in Gloucestershire, in both urban and rural areas.</i><i>elected county councillors have a key role to play, working with local communities, to resolve these concerns, finding effective road safety solutions to help pedestrians, cyclists and all road users.</i> <p><i>However, this council further notes that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>when county councillors request measures to reduce traffic speeds, even when offering to put their highways local funds towards it, policy and financial constraints mean they rarely come to fruition.</i><i>a key obstacle in securing some traffic calming measures is the cost of Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) and the lengthy processes needed to secure changes such as yellow lines.</i>	Philip Williams
----------	---	-----------------

Therefore this council resolves to:

- 1) ask Cabinet to review county council policies relating to traffic calming, including the use of physical design and vehicle activated signage, to aid councillors in securing evidence-based road changes.
- 2) write to the relevant Secretary of State to:
 - a. express our serious concern that national road safety guidelines are too restrictive and ask for the guidance to be reviewed to create a more enabling policy framework.
 - b. clarify what progress has been made to simplify the TRO process.
- 3) consider increasing the road safety budget for 2020-21 through the budget setting process, which could include a ring fenced budget for each council division.
- 4) build on existing local road safety initiatives to establish "road safety partnerships" for each of the six districts where there are none, and to formalise the relationship between road safety partnerships and the highways authority and county councillors.

Membership – Cllr Phil Awford, Cllr Iain Dobie (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Andrew Gravells, Cllr Terry Hale, Cllr Jeremy Hilton, Cllr Stephen Hirst (Chairman), Cllr Carole Allaway Martin, Cllr Shaun Parsons and Cllr Steve Robinson

Added Members -

Co-Opted Member -

(a) **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** – Members requiring advice or clarification about whether to make a declaration of interest are invited to contact the Acting Monitoring Officer (Rob Ayliffe Tel: 01452 328506 e-mail: rob.ayliffe@gloucestershire.gov.uk) prior to the start of the meeting.

(b) **INSPECTION OF PAPERS AND GENERAL QUERIES** - If you wish to inspect Minutes or Reports relating to any item on this agenda or have any other general queries about the meeting, please contact:
Stephen Bace, Lead Democratic Services Officer
☎:01452 324204/fax: 425850/e-mail: stephen.bace@gloucestershire.gov.uk

Please note that photography, filming and audio recording of Council meetings is permitted subject to the Local Government Access to Information provisions. Please contact Democratic Services (tel 01452 324202) to make the necessary arrangements ahead of the meeting. If you are a member of the public and do not wish to be photographed or filmed please inform the Democratic Services Officer on duty at the meeting.

EVACUATION PROCEDURE - in the event of the fire alarms sounding during the meeting please leave as



directed in a calm and orderly manner and go to the assembly point which is **outside the main entrance to Shire Hall in Westgate Street**. Please remain there and await further instructions.



This page is intentionally left blank

ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a meeting of the Adult Social Care and Communities Scrutiny Committee held on Tuesday 24 September 2019 at the Members' Room - Shire Hall, Gloucester.

PRESENT:

Cllr Stephen Hirst	Cllr Carole Allaway Martin
Cllr Iain Dobie	Cllr Terry Hale
Cllr Jeremy Hilton	Cllr Andrew Gravells
Cllr Steve Robinson	

Substitutes:

In attendance:

- Sarah Scott, Director Public Health
- Mark Branton, Deputy Director Adult Social Care
- Wayne Bowcock, Chief Fire Officer
- Philip Williams, Lead Commissioner Communities and Infrastructure
- Alexis Newport, Parking Manager
- Paul Yeatman, Independent Chair, Gloucestershire Safeguarding Board
- Jennifer Taylor, Lead Commissioner - Public Health
- Steve O'Neill, Outcome Manager, Public Health, PWC Hub
- Stephen Bace, Lead Democratic Services Officer
- Bob Lloyd Smith – Gloucestershire Healthwatch
- Cllr Tim Harman, Cabinet Member for Public Health and Communities

Apologies:

- Cllr Shaun Parsons
- Cllr Phil Awford

1. APOLOGIES

See above.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on the 11 June 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 August 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

The minutes of the Joint meeting with Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 30 July 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No additional declarations.

4. DRUG AND ALCOHOL BRIEFING

- 4.1 Sarah Scott, Director of Public Health introduced the report with further information provided by Jennifer Taylor, Lead Commissioner - Public Health and Steve O'Neill, Commissioning Manager Drug and Alcohol services. The report summarised the recent context for adult (18+) drug and alcohol treatment services in Gloucestershire as well as the current activity and performance and key priorities for the coming year. Some case studies had been provided to show the complexity of the service.
- 4.2 Gloucestershire County Council Public Health was responsible for commissioning the drug and alcohol treatment recovery services for adults. Improving outcomes from drug and alcohol services was a condition of the Public Health grant. Since 1 January 2017 the service had been provided by the national organisation Change, Grow, Live (CGL). This contract included a budget reduction from £5.9m per year to £5.1m, as well as the scope to better integrate services, delivering more than the previous service had. This had resulted in a new service model in Gloucestershire that had seen higher caseloads and increased group work. There had been a reduction in fixed hub with a greater emphasis on outreach work across the County.
- 4.3 The primary performance measure which was reported to scrutiny was:
- Proportion of adult alcohol misusers who had left treatment successfully
 - Proportion of all opiate users who have left treatment successfully, not representing in six months
 - Proportion of all non-opiate users who have left treatment successfully, not representing in six months
- 4.4 Although Gloucestershire saw a dip in treatment completions following recommissioning, the service was now performing well against national comparators. The upturn in performance that was shown in early-mid 2018 had been sustained and was beginning to plateau at its current level. Members understood that there was a wide range of performance across the country and discussed how close certain performance measures were to being in the top quartile of comparator local authorities, for example successful completions of opiate users.
- 4.5 Demand for services at the front door remained high for both alcohol and drug treatment with 2,569 people accessing services in 2018/19. The treatment

population was not evenly distributed across the county with nearly two thirds residing in Gloucester and Cheltenham.

4.6 Areas of focus going forward:

- Harm reduction including spread of MSRA
- Understanding impact of alcohol use on the hospitals
- Work with CCG, 2gether trust – effective support for those with mental health and drug and alcohol services

4.7 One member stated that she welcomed the improvement that had been shown following the dip in performance during the transition phase. She asked where assessment took place in the system and who referred individuals into it. It was explained that self-referral was the main entry point. Assessment took place in the hubs mainly, but there was some outreach that took place in districts to find a more convenient location. It was clarified that the three week measure was from the self-referral to treatment so the assessment took place in that window.

4.8 It was explained that there were good links between CGL and 2gether Trust in terms of working with people who have co-existing mental health conditions. Members were referred to the case studies which provided examples of the complex work being carried out.

4.9 One member explained that in America there was a lot of media coverage on opioids and he asked whether this was a problem in Gloucestershire. In response it was explained that due to a number of factors this was not a 'crisis' in Britain but that there was clearly an issue around opioids. The CCG were doing some work on this and a recent report was published by Public Health England (PHE).. It was suggested that further information be provided to members once available.

ACTION Jennifer Taylor

4.10 One member welcomed the geographical breakdown of the data within the paper. In response to his questions it was explained that the data was being closely examined to set the future direction of the service, particularly at the stage where it would need to be recommissioned.. One member raised the issue of those clients coming back into the system as opposed to new clients. It was explained that this was the nature of addiction that individuals could be referred multiple times. A deep dive exercise of the data would help to identify which individuals were new clients. Members would receive an update of this work in six months time.

ACTION Jennifer Taylor

4.11 There was some discussion regarding 'County Lines' and the impact of drug dealing; members wondered how information was provided to and from the police, without compromising the integrity of the service. In response it was explained that there was good communication with the Police. While County Lines did not equate to a significant amount of individuals accessing the service, the real concern was regarding the strength of the drugs being dealt and the impact on people accessing them. The Police would also refer individuals for help where they were engaged in

County Lines. One member asked whether people who were homeless received support with drug and alcohol problems. It was confirmed that they were a group who special efforts were made to reach.

- 4.12 It was questioned, what efforts were being made to draw people into the service. It was explained that the contract involved a number of aspects that involved partners to help reach those that perhaps did not want to be reached. So far those attempts had not generated a need that the service was not resourced to meet.
- 4.13 Members were provided with details of the approach being taken by the 'Blue Lights Project' pilot which was an assertive multi-disciplinary team that looked to get individuals into treatment and access to support.

5. PARKING REVIEW

- 5.1 Philip Williams, Lead Commissioner, Communities and Infrastructure and Alexis Newport, Parking Manager, gave a presentation on the GCC Parking Strategy. This strategy included consideration of the Local Transport Plan, the Air Quality and Public Health Strategy, Climate Change considerations, Electric Vehicle infrastructure, as well as the new parking enforcement contract and countywide parking review programme. It was explained that transport system supported all of society including the most vulnerable. In addition transport emissions had a big impact on those demographic groups.
- 5.2 Through a competitive procurement process, Marston had been commissioned as the new parking enforcement contract. A lot of functions had been brought back in-house. Income exceeded costs in relation to parking enforcement so this was then put back into the transport budget as was a requirement due to the County Council being the Local Highways Authority.
- 5.3 Members received information on previous parking reviews and were shown a timetable of the parking reviews taking place in 2019 through October 2021. It would take around 5 years to complete all the reviews. Reviews had previously focused on the Cheltenham area and the Council was now on the second phase of reviews which focussed much wider across the county. A priority assessment was undertaken, some areas hadn't been reviewed in some years and so these were the areas being prioritised.
- 5.4 At this stage of the review, survey data was being gathered. Members were taken through the scheme up to October 2021 and provided with an update of work to engage with the local members and parish and town councils. Further information was provided on the consultation and collaboration process to ensure good governance. For each TRO proposed due regard would be considered.
- 5.5 The Resident parking policy was implemented in 2009, which introduced policy surrounding resident and business permits, carers permits (free of charge), visitors vouchers, waivers and hotel permits. All on street charges were increased on 1

April 2019 in order to align with off street charges and the cost of local bus travel. Increased flexibility was introduced through pay per minute.

- 5.6 New guidance was put in place for Blue Badge holders. It wasn't clear what impact that would have at this early stage. Members were provided with statistics around blue badges, detailing that 10,427 badges had been issued in between June 2018 and June 2019 with 23 cases of fraud.
- 5.7 Arle Court park and ride was provided as an example of an innovative system with private and public collaboration with the aim to reduce park and walkers to allow park and ride use. There had been a 20% increase in bus travel. The use of technology was particularly important in this system with an electronic bus validation interface.
- 5.8 One member asked whether there were still parking permits available for electric vehicles and asked how many had been bought and the charges relating to this. The information would be provided.
ACTION Alexis Newport
- 5.9 One member suggested that there was a political choice to the where in the budget and how income from parking could be used. He suggested a number of areas where money could be reinvested such as cycling. In response it was explained that the income had to be reinvested into highways, transport or the environment. The net surplus from parking equated to less than one tenth of the overall budget for highways, transport and the environment. Decisions had to be made as part of the budget discussions as to how that income was allocated.
- 5.10 One member expressed disappointment that parking around schools had not been addressed in the presentation. He outlined that the Police spent a great deal of time solving issues caused by poor parking around schools, including working with the local member. It was explained that a new travel team had been created as well as the launch of the cycle strategy. Work was carried out with all schools in Gloucestershire to give them the materials and support to promote this. Work in this area to help individuals walk or cycle to school could help reduce those parking pressures.
- 5.11 In response to a question it was recognised that there was frustration around the time it took to change traffic orders. The team that carried out that work had been moved in-house. This was an area of work that required extra resource and this would be under consideration during the budget process. One member commented that in the past the terms and conditions for parking enforcement officers had been an issue. It was explained that staff retention had been a problem in the past and that part of the recommissioning of the contract in this area had focussed on ensuring quality over cost.
- 5.12 There was some discussion around parking charges with one member questioning whether they would be raised again. He was concerned that families who were not wealthy would be stretched by further increases. In response it was stated that the Council's policy was to align these charges with off-street charging. Some districts

had put their charges up and there was a danger that the current rates were undercutting them. No decisions had been taken but it was suggested that many residents would like to see their schemes reviewed.

- 5.13 One member asked questions regarding consideration of parking at pre-application stage and gave the example of an upcoming planning consideration for a Cheltenham School. In response it was explained that the officers could not comment regarding that particular application as it was to be considered by the Planning Committee.
- 5.14 In response to a question it was clarified that for residents wishing to have permits it was helpful to have the support of the community, potentially through a parish or town council.

6. GLOUCESTERSHIRE SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT

- 6.1 Paul Yeatman introduced the Annual Report. He had been in post 5 years as independent chair which was a joint appointment between the police and Clinical Commissioning Group. The overall purpose of the report was to give confidence and reassurance to the public and leadership of the organisations involved that the Safeguarding Adults Board was committed to and was capable of discharging its role.
- 6.2 Members were informed that calls could now be made by professionals to a Safeguarding Adults Team Advice Line. Professionals could call this line to receive advice on whether or not to raise a safeguarding concern. There had been 4,119 calls. The line was being reviewed to ensure it was fit for purpose. The number of safeguarding concerns raised was 2,077.
- 6.3 GSAB had commissioned one Safeguarding Adults Review and one local Learning Review. Members were provided with some detail regarding a 2017 incident which was the subject of a Serious Case Review.
- 6.4 Six roadshows were held across the County, with two in Gloucester, two in Cheltenham, one in the Forest of Dean and one in Cirencester. The theme had been domestic abuse. In March 2020, six more roadshows were planned with a focus on the voluntary community sector.
- 6.5 As part of the priorities for the board it was explained that there was a need to raise awareness of safeguarding and promote the welfare of vulnerable adults. In relation to those high risk individuals with complex needs, a high risk behaviour policy had been introduced, focussed on getting partners around the table to plan appropriate support and protection for that individual. In addition work was being undertaken with partners in children's services to support individuals who were transitioning into adulthood.

- 6.6 Members discussed the fact that Gloucestershire was an 'importer' of individuals with Learning Disabilities who had places in a number of homes. It was explained that it was the responsibility of the local authority who placed the individual in a home to meet that cost. There were other costs though associated with health needs that the individual might have.

7. ANNUAL PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

The item was deferred to next meeting.

8. DIRECTOR PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT

- 8.1 Sarah Scott, Director of Public Health, introduced the report.
- 8.2 Members noted the detail within the report regarding Accommodation Based Support services to help provide support for the most vulnerable. The Committee recognised the partnership working in place. Members commented that the recent visit to the homeless hubs had been very informative and helpful.
- 8.3 The Committee welcomed the information on the armed forces covenant. One member commented that the newsletter represented a snapshot and understood that there was a great deal of work being undertaken in this area.

9. DIRECTOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE REPORT

- 9.1 Mark Branton, Adult Social Care, introduced the report outlining the concerns around the reassessments of individuals within a timely period. He explained that it was recognised that for some individuals their needs have not significantly changed and so a light touch review was carried out. This would not meet the criteria set out nationally and impacted performance figures. There were still difficulties in ascertaining what proportion had been seen and so work was being carried out in this area. In the team, there were a significant number of people on maternity leave and vacancies. There was a programme in place to fill vacancies.
- 9.2 One member asked that if a client who was in a care home was only requiring a light touch reassessment was that an indicator that they had gone into care too soon. In response it was explained that now there was a reduction in number of people going into care but, before that work had been carried out, people used to go in too soon, particularly around dementia.

10. CHIEF FIRE OFFICER REPORT

- 10.1 Wayne Bowcock, Chief Fire Officer, introduced the report. He provided an update on the HMICFRS Inspection explaining that concerns had been raised regarding fire protection capacity and how the Service evidenced the risk based inspection programme. Bullying harassment and previous concerning leadership behaviours were still present but there was cautious optimism from staff. There would be a re-inspection over 3 days from 20 November 2019 looking over the evidence in the areas identified. It was recognised that culture change does not happen over night and the inspection team would be looking for signs of improvement.
- 10.2 GFRS had started a six week period of consultation with trade unions, staff and stakeholders on 5 August 2019. Members queried what additional resources the Service would require through the Medium Term Financial Strategy bid. It was explained that additional posts would be asked for and any amount would also need to cover the issues around national pensions. Members requested that a report go to the Committee outlining the request and to get the input of scrutiny members.
- ACTION** **Wayne Bowcock**
- 10.3 One member referred to the potential tension within the service of ensuring that there was enough experience alongside training requirements. It was explained that between now and 2022 there would be a number of leavers and with that a great deal of experience would be lost. Traditionally the number of incidents had provided on the job training for Firefighters, but a reduction in those incidents meant that additional training needed to be put in place. There was a balance between preventative work and the training required to make sure Firefighters had the skill set required.
- 10.4 It was explained that the Fire College was used as required when particular courses were available.
- 10.5 There was some discussion around the additional responsibilities firefighters had around co-responding and cardiac care. Members understood the national discussions around the terms and conditions of a firefighter. In Gloucestershire firefighters continued to volunteer for this role and the Chief Fire Officer would not be asking them to stop putting themselves forward. It was recognised that GFRS did not have a high proportion of firefighters in the Fire Brigades Union.
- 10.6 With regards to Skillzone, a targeted approach had been taken to allow free entry for those schools that had a high percentage of pupils from high deprivation backgrounds.

CHAIRMAN

Meeting concluded at 12:40pm

Minutes subject to their acceptance as a correct record at the next meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

SUBJECT	Adult Social Care and Communities Scrutiny Committee
	Road Safety Motion 843
DATE	29 th October 2019
PURPOSE OF REPORT	Briefing notes relating to Referral of Motion 843 to this committee
ACTIONS REQUIRED	Notes provided to empower discussion
RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS	None
CIRCULATION	Adult Social Care and Communities Scrutiny Committee
AUTHOR	Andrew Parker-Mowbray (Road Safety and Transportation Data Team Leader).

Background

During the County Council meeting of 11th September a Motion was put forward to enable road safety measures

Update on Road Safety in the County

The Road Safety Partnership with the Police ended early in 2018. The following short summary highlights the main changes and the activities which are continuing to be delivered.

The School Crossing service and Bikeability are now located within Integrated Transport Unit which allows these activities to work more closely towards modal shift, sustainable travel, Think Travel, school streets and of course contribute towards reductions in pollution.

Safety Audit is now within Highways Development Management. Capital Schemes are still audited as before, but now the same skills and knowledge is being extended to new developments as well.

Police Casualty Data is still being evaluated to empower engineering safety schemes. The Casualty Data Team are now co-located within Network and Traffic Team where closer working with TRO team, Traffic Data and wider highways teams is possible.

The Police have been able to increase their enforcement potential with additional vans and operators. The Police continue to work closely with GCC and are willing to use available data to help determine where/when to carry out enforcement.

Website information and advice on Road Safety is no longer on the standalone Road Safety Partnership website. The pages have been updated and placed within the GCC Highways pages offering improved collision map and data pages.

SkillZONE continues to have a Road Safety scenario and provides timely knowledge to children who are about to move to secondary schools and be allowed greater freedom to be unaccompanied for journeys on the roads. SkillZONE also interacts with many hard to reach groups such as those with special educational needs.

A joint post funded by GFRS and OPCC delivers education interventions drawing on the resources of both Gloucestershire Fire and the Constabulary. The popular 'What If' roadshow continues to be delivered to schools targeting the 16-24 age group who continue to be over represented in the casualty data.

The current lead for the Police and Crime Commissioner's Safe and Social Driving priority is Assistant Chief Fire Officer - Mark Astle

Road Safety Highlights

- School crossing patrol service cross approximately about 5000 pupils per day
- Each year Bikeability trains about 4500 pupils to ride more confidently and safely
- Safety audit knowledge is being shared across HDM ensuring developer schemes are safer.
- Each year more than 6600 6th form pupils receive targeted road safety education
- In the past 10 years the total number of road traffic casualties has almost halved (1877 in 2008 down to 977 in 2018)
- Enforcement resources continue to increase more than 20,000 offenders processed each year.
- Since the beginning of the current year the road safety webpages have has almost 19,000 page views
- The Road Safety Capital budget for 2020/21 is £450,000
- SkillZONE is anticipating approximately 6000 visits this year

Road Safety Motion

This Council notes that:

- Road safety and traffic speeds are of significant concern to many residents in Gloucestershire, in both urban and rural area.
- Elected county councillors have a key role to play, working with local communities, to resolve these concerns, finding effective road safety solutions to help pedestrians, cyclists and all road users.

However, this Council further notes that:

- When County Councillors request measures to reduce traffic speeds, even when offering to put their highways local funds towards it, policy and financial constraints mean they rarely come to fruition.
- A key obstacle in securing some traffic calming measures is the cost of Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) and the lengthy processes needed to secure changes such as yellow lines.

Therefore this Council resolves to:

- a) Ask Cabinet to review County Council policies relating to traffic calming, including the use of physical design and vehicle activated signage, to aid councillors in securing evidence-based road changes.
- b) Write to the relevant Secretary of State to:
 - i) Express our serious concern that national road safety guidelines are too restrictive and ask for the guidance to be reviewed to create a more enabling policy framework.
 - ii) Clarify what progress has been made to simplify the TRO process.
- c) Consider increasing the road safety budget for 2020-21 through the budget setting process, which could include a ring fenced budget for each council division.

d) Build on existing local road safety initiatives to establish “road safety partnerships” for each of the six districts where there are none, and to formalise the relationship between road safety partnerships and the highways authority and county councillors.

Road Safety Motion issues

1. Concern about the Traffic Regulation Process blocking the implementation of schemes

What are TRO's

A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is the legal document required to support a range of measures, which govern or restrict the use of public roads, including: Double yellow lines, One-way streets, Banned turns, Speed Restrictions, weight restrictions or Bus lanes.

Why do we need TROs?

UK law requires that TROs be in place to enable the police or, in the case of parking and bus lanes, the council, to enforce these restrictions.

To create a TRO

Consultation with the emergency services and other public bodies takes place. Local interest groups such as residents and traders may be consulted where appropriate.

Advertisement of the TRO then takes place by placing a notice in the local press and displaying notices in the roads affected. Objections are then considered through the appropriate council procedure before it is decided how the matter will be taken forward.

The TRO will then be formally made and introduced. The entire process can take many months to complete especially if objections result in the TRO being changed and re-advertised.

Link to GCC TRO factsheet for more detail

https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/media/2855/gcc_1512_highways_tro_factsheet_dev3-optionb-66132.pdf

Why are TROs seen as a block?

The TRO process or Police approval is sometimes cited as the block to schemes, this may not always be the case.

In some instances there are concerns about the proposals failing to meet relevant design standards or guidance and it is often the extensive experience of the members of the TRO team which has highlighted the issues for the first time.

2. Frustrating for local communities who were best placed to judge on what was needed in their areas

Local knowledge is extremely useful to help evolve the correct solution. Good road casualty data is also essential to ensure that limited resources are targeted at the right groups, areas and issues, in the right priority order and in the most effective way. Before any road safety programme (engineering, education, enforcement or a combination) can be planned, it is essential to identify the problems that need to be tackled and the most appropriate ways of doing so, otherwise there is the very real risk of spending those resources ineffectively.

“Do we have to wait until someone is killed?” There is a real challenge facing many councillors when balancing requests from local residents with the need to allocate resources properly across the whole of the council’s area. Local residents will request action on their own street, and will expect their local Councillor to support them. However, members have to balance their role as local champion against that as a councillor with responsibility across your whole area. If the available evidence shows that a perceived problem in an area is not actually a road safety problem at all, this can be a difficult message for a councillor to convey. A perceived problem, however, may be a real

barrier to people choosing to walk and cycle, and therefore, may justify action as part of the council's overall sustainable travel strategy.

Link to RoSPA guide – Road Safety: A guide for Local Councillors in England

<https://www.rospa.com/rospaweb/docs/advice-services/road-safety/practitioners/local-councillors-guide.pdf>

3. Public have no idea of the complexity of TRO process

The GCC website contains several pages explaining the TRO process

<https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/traffic-regulation-orders-tro-and-traffic-schemes/>

Conclusion

There appears to be some misunderstanding between members and officers around what are achievable and appropriate interventions to improve safety and safety concerns.

These misunderstandings are probably the catalyst for this motion, a mutual understanding for members and officers would be of benefit.

A presentation by officers at committee will seek to address some of these points.

Recommendation

A small task group of interested members and relevant officers be established to work through the various interventions with the task of reporting to scrutiny within six months.