

# **Borough Liaison with the Emergency Services. A study towards good practice**

## **Final Report**

Roselle Thoreau  
Heather Ward

Centre for Transport Studies  
University College London  
Gower Street  
London WC1E 6BT

Tel: +44 20 7679 1597  
Fax: +44 20 7679 1567  
Minicom: 020 7679 1595  
email: [roselle@transport.ucl.ac.uk](mailto:roselle@transport.ucl.ac.uk)

**20<sup>th</sup> May 2005**

# Contents

<a href="#">Executive Summary</a> .....	i
<a href="#">1. Introduction</a> .....	1
<a href="#">1.1 Background and Objectives</a> .....	1
<a href="#">1.2 Study objectives</a> .....	2
<a href="#">1.3 Method of working</a> .....	3
<a href="#">1.4 Structure of the report</a> .....	3
<a href="#">2. Questionnaire</a> .....	4
<a href="#">2.1 Interviews</a> .....	4
<a href="#">2.2 Questionnaire</a> .....	5
<a href="#">2.3 Questionnaire results</a> .....	5
<a href="#">3. Seminar</a> .....	9
<a href="#">3.1 Purpose and outline of the seminar</a> .....	9
<a href="#">3.2 Seminar outcomes</a> .....	9
<a href="#">4. Recommendations for good practice</a> .....	12
<a href="#">4.1 An Annual Special Traffic Liaison Meeting</a> .....	12
<a href="#">4.2 Obtaining contacts</a> .....	12
<a href="#">4.3 Emergency Service Priority Routes</a> .....	13
<a href="#">4.4 Statutory Consultations</a> .....	13
<a href="#">4.5 Joint Site Visits</a> .....	13
<a href="#">4.6 Workshops</a> .....	13
<a href="#">4.7 Personal relationships</a> .....	14
<a href="#">5. Conclusion</a> .....	14
<a href="#">5.1 Conclusions of the research procedure</a> .....	14
<a href="#">5.2. Further suggestions</a> .....	16
<a href="#">6. References</a> .....	16
<a href="#">7. Acknowledgements</a> .....	17
<a href="#">Appendix 1: Questionnaire</a> .....	18
<a href="#">Appendix 2: Summary of results given at March 10<sup>th</sup> seminar</a> .....	26
<a href="#">Appendix 3: Summary of analysis of statements</a> .....	28
<a href="#">Appendix 4: Internet addresses</a> .....	29
<a href="#">Appendix 5: List of respondents</a> .....	30
<a href="#">Appendix 6: List of organisations attending the seminar</a> .....	31

## Executive Summary

This report will a) examine the processes currently in place for communication between emergency services and individual London boroughs and look at the differences across the boroughs; b) develop a questionnaire to assess what procedures currently in place are working effectively and those which do not work; c) create a final document which suggests those procedures which work best for both groups.

## Objectives

The Association of London Governments (ALG) would like to obtain a deeper knowledge of:

- The methods used by boroughs across London to liaise with the emergency services;
- Boroughs' opinions of what works and what doesn't and what the barriers are to effective liaison;
- Emergency services' opinions of what works and what doesn't and what the barriers are to effective liaison;
- The identification of practices and processes that currently hinder the work of emergency services and boroughs and therefore should be avoided;
- The mechanisms for ensuring effective liaison and dialogue that could be developed into protocol for borough / emergency service liaison.

## Interviews

A set of interviews was conducted with a small number of people to discover and understand the issues behind the existing communication and liaison methods. The issues raised were then used as the basis for drafting the questionnaire. A small group of people from the emergency services and local authorities were interviewed about their role within their organisation and their role in liaising with the other organisations. All sides acknowledge problems, or a tradition of problems with liaison between the London boroughs and the emergency services. Similarly, all groups are eager to reduce this.

## Questionnaire

Using the variables from the interviews and the literature review a questionnaire was developed to investigate the project objectives. The questionnaire was delivered to 174 people in all the London boroughs and emergency services.

Table 1: Response rate to questionnaire by organisation

Organisation	Number of Responses	Number of Questionnaires Sent	% of Responses
London Borough	25	85	29
LAS	9	25	36
LFB	10	39	26
Police Service	18	20	90
Other	4	5	80

- A total of 21% stated that they had a written policy for liaison. The London Fire Brigade (LFB) were the most likely to have a written policy with 62% of LFB respondents saying they had a written policy.

- 86% of those who responded said they had traffic liaison meetings. Almost all that had these meetings found them to be beneficial (98%). Generally these meetings are held every 3 months (39%).
- A substantial majority of people (89%) thought that their traffic liaison meetings were held as often as needed.
- Most cited not enough attendance (58%) as the main reason for their cessation
- The most commonly cited reason for holding traffic liaison meetings was that they provided people with a direct contact to a person with whom they could liaise. They are also found to be useful because they allow quick decisions to be reached and a forum to get opinions on schemes at an early stage.
- Almost half (46%) of emergency services respondents said they have emergency service priority routes.
- Most of the borough respondents had not received emergency service priority routes from any of the emergency services (50%)
- Most respondents felt that copies of these routes should be given to the boroughs (80% of emergency services respondents and 93% of borough respondents).
- A number of emergency service respondents would like to have copies of the other emergency service priority routes.
- The majority of respondents found that statutory consultations have enough detail (82%).
- The majority of respondents said that they received consultations with enough time to comment (79%). While this proportion is high it also means that one in five consultations is not reaching their target in time.
- All the respondents from the boroughs and from Transport for London said the feedback they received from these consultation notices was useful and all of those who didn't receive feedback said some would be useful.
- Of the responses 58% said they had completed joint site visits. Of those who did 57% occurred when difficulties had been raised while 25% occurred on complex schemes. Of those respondents who didn't have site visits 71% of people said they would be beneficial.
- The less general communication there was the more likely people were to want more communication with the other organisations. Over half (53%) felt the other organisation(s) needed to communicate more internally.
- 51% felt their own organisation needed to communicate more internally.
- 37% felt their own organisation needed to communicate more with the other organisations.
- 51% wanted more feedback.
- Most people felt their suggestions were being listened to (57%).
- Most respondents were satisfied with how they communicated with 54% "agreeing" or "strongly agreeing". However a substantial proportion still felt that the way they communicate needed to be improved with 43% agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement.

## Seminar

The purpose of the seminar was to discuss the feasibility of the draft recommendations and to redefine them so that they would be broadly accepted by those who will use them. The seminar was carried out in a combined group so that the opinions of each of the organisations involved could be heard by other members and practical solutions could reflect what all groups could achieve.

## Recommendations for good practice

The interviews, questionnaire and seminar all raised broadly similar issues regarding barriers and facilitators to more effective working. The seminar was particularly helpful in bringing issues out into the open and allowing all sides to discuss their particular problems. The recommendations presented here emanated from the wide ranging discussions at the seminar and as such should be broadly acceptable to the boroughs and emergency services across London.

There is a case for providing outside groups information as early as is practicable. The earlier information is given out the more feedback is received, and the more likely an acceptable solution to all could be reached. The more often this occurs the more likely similarly good communication practices will occur again in the future. The more the boroughs and the emergency services communicate with each other the better the communication and the more effective their work. Where boroughs and emergency services have good relationships the methods they use should be continued. If traffic liaison meetings don't work well but they use other methods to communicate then there is no reason to force a strategy that doesn't fit their situation. These recommendations are suggestions for those who feel their communication could be improved.

### An Annual Special Traffic Liaison Meeting

An annual traffic management meeting could be held by all boroughs. This meeting should be attended by at least one representative from each emergency service and by both road safety officers and engineers from a borough. The meeting would not replace future normal meetings or other methods of communication but be an additional event. The purpose of the meeting would be to:

1. Review how liaison has been working over the past year.
2. Discuss any ways in which methods could be revised.
3. Let each of the other organisations know of any new/continuous initiatives and targets that exist for them.
4. Revise the frequency of the regular traffic liaison meetings.
5. Revise the length of time currently given for statutory consultations.
6. Let the boroughs and emergency services meet face-to-face with the relevant contacts they correspond with during the year.
7. Introduce any new people who have joined within the year.
8. Update strategic route maps.
9. Update/check contact details of people.
10. Pass on any other relevant information.

One of the reasons for areas with previously good communication methods going downhill is changes to staff. This happens in all organisations. At staff changeover there need to be good handover procedures in operation so that contact lists are passed on and introductions made. Whilst an annual meeting will help new staff meet these contacts personally, changes do occur in the interim and efforts should be made to make contacts during the year.

### Obtaining contacts

A central resource, perhaps web based, giving out contact details for staff in each area of road safety could prove useful. Currently boroughs have websites where the public can access information. Some of these websites have details of contacts in each department. Other

organisations have relevant websites as well. The Local Authority Road Safety Officers Association (LARSOA) lists all the road safety officers for each authority in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. The London Fire Brigade website lists all the borough commanders and their contact details. These websites are listed in Appendix 4. These details and similar lists of contacts for the police and for the LAS could be listed on a central website accessible to those from the relevant organisations. If updated regularly by all this could be an easy way of quickly finding the relevant person with whom to talk.

### **Emergency Service Priority Routes**

Those emergency services that have strategic route networks should give boroughs a copy. Boroughs are entitled to place traffic calming schemes on these roads but because they are of high importance to emergency services alternative strategies should be considered and consultation should begin at the earliest possible stage.

On the part of the boroughs, those boroughs that have maps/plans of current traffic calming schemes/one-way streets should make these available to the emergency services. Whilst it would be useful if all boroughs had such plans, it is recognised that this does take time and resources. However, it would be helpful for a list of roads with such schemes to be created.

### **Statutory Consultations**

Emergency services should aim to return statutory consultations with feedback. If they disagree with a scheme then reasons and alternative suggestions would be helpful. Boroughs need to give emergency services time to comment (a time limit of how long is needed to provide notice needs to be jointly agreed by each individual area). Ideally once an issue has reached formal consultation stage, the emergency services should have already been made aware of it.

### **Joint Site Visits**

Joint site visits work well where they are used. Where there is time and the resources these could be used to find solutions where schemes are particularly complex or objections to them have been raised and alternative solutions need to be found. However, a site visit is not always appropriate for all emergency services. Perhaps a list of criterion for when a site visit is needed could be created.

### **Workshops**

One of the strongest messages to come out of the study is that the relationship between the LAS at a local level and the boroughs is often poor. From information gathered at all stages of the study there still appears to be a degree of tension over traffic calming schemes. It would be helpful if this could be brought out into the open at a workshop designed so that both sides can learn more about the operational needs of the other. The workshops, suggested at the seminar, could be broadened so that the boroughs, the police, the LFB and the LAS all put forward their operational difficulties.

### **Personal relationships**

The key issue to emerge from the study was that of personal relationships. Many of the people consulted felt that they had more effective liaison where they knew the people they were liaising with. Rather than only have letter or email contact with a person from another organisation good liaison includes having met people on more than one occasion and being comfortable enough to contact them outside of statutory requirements and planned meetings. One of the purposes of traffic liaison meetings is to build contacts through which information can be communicated between meetings. In this manner information would reach people before formal consultation.

However, where there is already poor communication it is even more difficult to foster positive relationships. For example, if the emergency service does not receive a consultation in time to comment it could be because the borough is not sending it to the correct person and it is getting stuck on the wrong person's desk who fails to pass it on in time. This highlights how important it is for the borough to know the correct person to send the consultation to.

When communication is poor there is a tendency of each party to have a negative image of the other. This makes it more difficult to find a way to start improving communication. Perhaps people from all groups need a central contact within the different organisations to break down the barriers that contribute to the poor communication.

Therefore, one the most important facilitators to effective liaison is the creation and maintenance of personal relationships. This needs to be encouraged.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background and Objectives

The Government has introduced road casualty reduction targets of a 40 per cent reduction in the number of killed or seriously injured casualties and a 50 percent reduction in the number of children killed or seriously injured by 2010. Over and above the national casualty reduction targets the Mayor of London has introduced targets aimed at addressing some specific casualty groups within London. These are to reduce by 40 percent in each group, the number of killed or seriously injured pedestrians, pedal cyclists and powered two wheeler users. Thus the ever present need for design and implementation of effective casualty reduction measures together with increased emphasis on partnership working is helping to highlight the need for improved liaison and communication across a wide range of road safety issues and stakeholders.

#### 1.1.1 The players in casualty reduction

The Road Traffic Act 1988 (Section 39) specifies that local highway authorities must provide a road safety service aimed at road accident prevention which includes road safety engineering schemes, education, publicity and training. In London, Transport for London (TfL) is the funding provider for highway matters and is responsible for the safety of the main road network throughout the capital whilst the boroughs are responsible for local roads.

The two police forces in London have a wide range of experience in both traffic management and road safety and play a key role in the delivery of road safety through enforcement and education. Liaison between the police and boroughs is ongoing on several other fronts with joint road safety campaigns and investigation of problems affecting their areas through audits as part of the requirements of the Crime and Disorder Act (1998).

The London Fire Brigade (LFB) and The London Ambulance Service (LAS) are often present at road traffic accidents and have insights into local problems. They are also operationally affected by TfL and borough traffic management and road safety engineering schemes in the way they can respond to emergencies and their ability to manoeuvre their vehicles around, and over scheme elements.

#### 1.1.2 The need for effective communication

Vital to the development and implementation of effective road safety schemes is good communication between the London Boroughs and the emergency services. It is often lack of effective early dialogue in the planning phases of schemes and strategic policy developments that leads to difficulties at the stage of the required formal consultation process. Liaison between London boroughs and their corresponding emergency services has at times been difficult.

A variety of communication styles with differing degrees of effectiveness is not unique to London. Capita Symonds (2004) in their report to the Department for Transport on assessing the casualty reduction performance of local highway authorities, found that the better performing local authorities maintained closer relationships and sought to encourage more dialogue with police and other relevant groups than the lower performing ones.

### 1.1.3 Types of consultation

There are effectively two types of consultation. When a road safety scheme is planned informal liaison should start early with the police and emergency services (and others as appropriate) especially where it might affect their operations in terms of routeing or response times.

A good practice guide for fire and ambulance services states that the emergency services and highway authorities need to keep a good level of discussion going and consultation should be started as early as possible in the design and implementation of all types of schemes.

For some schemes this is all that is needed but the local authority is required to make Traffic Regulation Orders when it is necessary to regulate the speed, movement and parking of vehicles, and to regulate pedestrian movement (see Department of Transport Local Authority Circular 5/96). When an Order needs to be made the proper process must be followed and this includes consultation with the police, fire, and ambulance services. This consultation is by formal letter to the appropriate officer in each service. There is no time laid down in the circular for this process but when notices are posted on the street they must be displayed for a minimum of 21 days. It seems reasonable that the emergency services should be given at least this much time.

Featherstone's (2004) report on the effectiveness of road humps and their impact highlighted a number of issues of liaison between the London boroughs and the emergency services.

*“The Metropolitan Police Authority, London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority and Department of Health should ensure that the emergency services respond fully to borough consultations on traffic calming and consistently attend and take part in local traffic management meetings held by the boroughs”*

## 1.2 Study objectives

Featherstone (2004) suggested that the Pan London Road Safety Forum could issue best practice guidance on the consultation process and investigate which practices work effectively and which of these can be recommended to all London boroughs.

Following from this, the Association of London Government (ALG) has commissioned the Centre for Transport Studies at University College London to develop a draft protocol (for voluntary adoption) which reflects best practice in liaison in road safety matters between the London Boroughs and the emergency services. The objectives and scope of the research are:

To identify:

- The methods used by boroughs across London to liaise on road safety issues with the emergency services;
- Boroughs' opinions of what works and what doesn't and what the barriers are to effective liaison;
- Emergency services' opinions of what works and what doesn't and what the barriers are to effective liaison;
- The identification of practices and processes that currently hinder the work of emergency services and boroughs and therefore should be avoided;
- The mechanisms for ensuring effective liaison and dialogue that could be developed into protocol for borough / emergency service liaison.

Good practice methods may differ both in and outside of London and around London. Methods that work well in one area may not be practicable somewhere else.

### ***1.3 Method of working***

There are three parts to this study:

- (1) the development of a questionnaire through a literature search and interviews with a range of people from the emergency services and boroughs;
- (2) the administration of a large-sample questionnaire to emergency services, TfL and borough staff across London and the subsequent analysis of the responses, and;
- (3) a seminar involving a range of people from all emergency services and a sample of boroughs to discuss the feasibility of the recommendations.

### ***1.4 Structure of the report***

In section 2 the results of the questionnaire are described. The structure of the interviews and the questionnaire are also briefly discussed.

In section 3 the purpose and findings of the seminar are explained in detail. The issues that this has raised link back to the results of the questionnaire and to the recommendations for good practice.

In section 4, the final recommendations that we believe would be broadly accepted by all parties are described.

In section 5, a conclusion looking at the issues involved in carrying out the research and further suggestions as to what all groups can do to further encourage more effective liaison is described.

## 2. Questionnaire

### 2.1 Interviews

The purpose of the interviews was to discover and understand the issues behind existing communication and liaison methods. A small but representative group of people from the emergency services and local authorities were interviewed about their role within their organisation and their role liaising with the other organisations. People from numerous different boroughs and services were approached for an interview. Most interviews were conducted face-to-face (6) while others were conducted by phone (4) or email (2).

A total of 12 interviews were conducted;

- Four with police officers
- One with an ambulance officer
- Two with LFB officers
- Five with borough officers

Interviewees were asked about their role in liaising with the other organisations. They were asked how they communicated, whether they thought it worked, whether other methods had been used previously and why they were changed, what difficulties they faced in communicating and what methods they recommended using. A list of questions was taken to each interview to act as a prompting device but interviews were not structured to be identical.

#### 2.1.1 Interview results

All sides acknowledge problems, or a tradition of problems in liaison between the London boroughs and the emergency services. Similarly, all groups are eager to reduce this. Those boroughs which have or had regular traffic liaison meetings found that the London Ambulance Services (LAS) attendance was rare if at all. Comments received on statutory consultations were similarly rare. The boroughs generally had the strongest and most positive working relationship with the police. Communication between police and boroughs was not limited to statutory letters of consultation or traffic liaison meetings. The police were in phone and email contact and, in the boroughs that held them, were present at and sometimes asked for, site visits.

During the interviews the LFB and LAS said they had few difficulties with the consultation notices and generally had enough detail on which to comment and usually did not object. However, it was noted that the consultation notices were sometimes not received in time for them to raise questions or objections.

A substantial proportion of the boroughs were disheartened with the lack of response from the emergency services to the consultation notices. One borough noted that they never received any replies, positive or negative to the notices given out. This was viewed as particularly frustrating.

The boroughs opinions were mixed regarding the quality and effectiveness of communication. Some boroughs only send out the statutory letters of consultation and expressed frustration at the lack of response, especially from the LAS. Other boroughs had a far more positive relationship with emergency services. However no borough said their relationship was perfect, all maintained it could be improved.

The emergency services perception of their relationship with the boroughs was also mixed:

1. The police had the most positive relationship with the boroughs, generally having communication with borough contacts on a regular basis, weekly if not daily.
2. The LFB saw their relationship with the boroughs as generally positive and thought they received enough information
3. The LAS experienced a patchy relationship with the boroughs. There were two sources of this problem. One was the perceived difficulties in bringing together the views of the LAS regarding operational difficulties with some types of traffic calming and the needs of boroughs to implement effective schemes. A second issue was that lack of resources meant that it was difficult to assign someone from LAS to liaise with boroughs at a local level.

Several boroughs have traffic liaison meetings. These occur from monthly to every three months. An agenda is generally circulated before the meeting. The meetings operate as a place to communicate any concerns that the emergency services have over the designs of a scheme. Those who have the meetings regard them as a positive and useful way to get feedback. One of the benefits is that it can save time by being able to get feedback on a scheme in its early stages rather than when it has already had a lot of work put into it. The boroughs generally invite the Metropolitan Police, the LFB, the LAS, the London bus service and members of TfL. Attendance at these meetings varies. Those boroughs that do not have the meetings now have often held them in the past. The reasons cited for disbanding these meetings include lack of resources and lack of attendance.

Featherstone (2004) suggested that the emergency services felt that their views of traffic calming schemes were not being taken into account. This differs from what was found in the interviews where the emergency services did think that the boroughs listened to their concerns. In one of the interviews with a LFB representative it was stated that on the rare occasions they raised a concern about a scheme the designs were altered.

## **2.2 Questionnaire**

Using the variables from the interviews and the literature review a questionnaire was developed to investigate the study objectives. The questionnaire did not ask for participants names but questions were included to identify occupation and location.

The questionnaire was delivered to all London borough and emergency service staff whose duties involve liaising with each other. The questionnaire was intended to be short and to take between 10 and 20 minutes to complete. The questionnaire was delivered via email and post and could be returned by either method. Those who received their questionnaire by post were given a post paid addressed return envelope. A copy of the questionnaire is available in Appendix 1.

## **2.3 Questionnaire results**

The questionnaire was sent to 174 people and responses were received from 66 giving a 38% response rate. Table 1 shows the distribution of responses from the different organisations. A copy was sent to each contact in a borough and in several cases this means that more than one was sent (85 went to the boroughs). Reminders were sent by email and phone calls to chase up non-respondents in the boroughs. Of those who did return questionnaires there was a good spread across

the boroughs and when taken with the emergency services responses all boroughs were covered. Appendix 5 gives a list of the boroughs and emergency services who responded.

Table 1: Response rate to questionnaire by organisation

Organisation	Number of Responses	Number of Questionnaires Sent	% of Responses
London Borough	25	85	29
LAS	9	25	36
LFB	10	39	26
Police Service	18	20	90
TfL	4	5	80

The questionnaire asked whether respondents had a written policy for liaising with the boroughs or the emergency services. A total of 21% stated that they had a written policy for liaison. The LFB were the most likely to have a written policy with 62% of LFB respondents reporting they had a written policy. A total of 24% of police said they had a written policy for liaising with the boroughs. None of the LAS staff said they had a written policy and only 5% of the borough respondents said they had a written policy for liaison.

### 2.3.1 Traffic Liaison Meetings

86% of those who responded said they had traffic liaison meetings. Almost all that had these meetings found them to be beneficial (98%). Only 14% have these every month. Generally these meetings are held every 3 months (39%).

Table 2: Frequency of Traffic Liaison Meetings (TLM)

How often do you have TLM?	London Borough	LAS	LFB	Police Service	TfL	Total
	% within Organisation					
monthly	4	33	10	18	25	14
every six week	12	0	20	6	0	9
every two months	20	11	10	24	25	19
every quarter	40	44	40	35	25	39
less than 3 monthly	8	0	0	6	25	6
don't occur	16	11	20	12	0	14

A substantial majority of people (89%) thought that their traffic liaison meetings were held as often as needed, although 9% thought that they were not held as often as needed. Of those who no longer hold traffic liaison meetings most cited not enough attendance (58%) as the main reason for their cessation. Other reasons cited were not enough items to discuss; people attending had no power to make decisions and fixed schedule meetings too inflexible as issues constantly changing. Those who had traffic liaison meetings found them useful for a number of reasons. The most commonly cited reason was that they provided people with a direct contact to a person with whom they could liaise. Traffic liaison meetings are also found to be useful because they allow quick decisions to be reached and a forum to get opinions on schemes at an early stage. Also mentioned was that they gave the viewpoint of the other organisations and their constraints and they gave an overview of local issues. The main reason traffic liaison meetings were not found to be useful was that some respondents from the emergency services, the LAS in particular, found many of the issues not to be relevant (bus schemes). One suggestion given was that traffic liaison meetings should not always be

held at the local council but could be held at emergency service locations as well on a rotating schedule.

Table 3: Responses to whether TLM occur often enough

	London Borough	LAS	LFB	Police Service	TfL	Total
	% within Organisation					
too often	0	0	0	7	0	2
as often as needed	95	88	88	87	75	89
not often enough	5	13	13	7	25	9

### 2.3.2 Emergency Service Priority Routes

Almost half (46%) of emergency services respondents said they have emergency service priority routes, 38% said they did not have them while 16% did not know. Police were the least likely to know if they had these routes. Most of the borough respondents had not received emergency service priority routes from any of the emergency services (50%) while only 29% of boroughs have copies of emergency service priority routes from some or all emergency services. Of the emergency services respondents 23% said they had given copies to boroughs, just under half of those emergency services who said they had emergency service priority routes. Most respondents felt that copies of these routes should be given to the boroughs (80% of emergency services respondents and 93% of borough respondents). A number of emergency service respondents wrote on the questionnaire that they would like to have copies of the other emergency service priority routes.

### 2.3.3 Statutory Consultations

The response from the emergency service respondents regarding statutory consultation was largely positive. All respondents said the consultations were useful. The majority of respondents found that consultations have enough detail (82%). One response from the emergency services said they would appreciate the details of scheme consultations to include the purpose of the schemes and the advantages and disadvantages associated with it. Some written responses from the emergency services showed some problems with the detail of consultations including feeling as though schemes are already agreed upon before they reach consultation stage;

*“Many times the scheme has already been implemented or is in the process of being implemented prior to consultation notices being sent to me. It seems the councils treat the consultation process with contempt.”*

*“Some boroughs table schemes that will go before the council just to get a feel of our views. Others table schemes that are already funded and agreed by Council and are then asking our views. They always still go in regardless of objections.”*

The majority of respondents said that they received consultations with enough time to comment (79%). While this proportion is high it also means that one in five consultations are not reaching their target in time. This is an example of one of the comments from one of the respondents who felt consultations were not being sent with enough time.

*“If a borough or TfL do not provide enough information at consultation... I will then ask for that information to be provided. The trouble with not being furnished with enough information at the formal consultation stage is that once that information has been provided the time limit for reply has often expired.... Early informal consultation is an important effective way of communication prior to formal consultation.”*

All the respondents from the boroughs and from Transport for London said the feedback they received from these consultation notices was useful and all of those who didn't receive feedback said some would be useful. The response from the boroughs was somewhat positive; with 86% said they received some feedback, although many noted that this was not from all groups. The LAS was the main group cited as not giving feedback and the LFB was occasionally cited. The police were praised a number of times for consistently providing feedback.

#### 2.3.4 Joint Site Visits

Of the responses 58% said they had completed joint site visits. Of those who did 57% occurred when difficulties had been raised while 25% occurred on complex schemes. Of those respondents who didn't have site visits 71% of people said they would be beneficial. In written responses site visits were thought to be a good idea but the reasons for having them would need to be specific so groups only attended where it was relevant.

#### 2.3.5 Overall Effectiveness of Communication and Liaison Strategies

In general it was found that the less general communication there was the more likely people were to want more communication with the other organisations. Respondents were quite divided as to the quality of communication both in their own organisation and in the other organisation(s)

- Over half (53%) felt the other organisation(s) needed to communicate more internally.
- 51% felt their own organisation need to communicate more internally.
- 37% felt their own organisation needed to communicate more with the other organisation(s).
- 51% wanted more feedback.
- Most people felt their suggestions were being listened to (57%).
- Most respondents were satisfied with how they communicated with 54% "*agreeing*" or "*strongly agreeing*". However a substantial proportion still felt that they way they communicate needed to be improved with 43% agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement.

One question asked was what methods of communication were used; mail, email, phone call and meetings. Answers were separated by whether all these methods were ticked or whether only some of these methods were ticked. When all methods of communication were used the more effective communication is. Respondents who used all methods were less likely to agree that there was need for improvement, less likely to agree there was need for more communication, more likely to agree there was a lot of communication, less likely to think the other organisation(s) needed to communicate more internally or externally and less likely to think the other organisation(s) should provide more feedback. These results are available in a table in Appendix 3.

### 3. Seminar

#### 3.1 Purpose and outline of the seminar

The purpose of the seminar was to discuss the feasibility of the draft recommendations and to redefine them so that they would be broadly accepted by those who will use them. The seminar was carried out in a combined group so that the opinions of each of the organisations involved could be heard by other members and practical solutions could reflect what all groups could achieve.

The seminar was held at University College London between 10:30 and 12:30 on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2005. A total of 17 people attended from a variety of areas across London and included members of all the emergency services and six different boroughs. A list of where the attendees were from is in Appendix 6.

The seminar started with an oral presentation to the group reminding them of the study objectives, its background and a brief of the results to date. Appendix 2 has a summary of the results presented at the seminar. The draft recommendations arising from the questionnaire response was given followed by a discussion on the suggested methods for liaison. The group did not raise any questions of accuracy or interpretation of the questionnaire responses.

The draft recommendations presented were:

- *An annual traffic management meeting could be held by all boroughs. This meeting should be attended by at least one representative from each emergency service. This meeting would;*
  - Let boroughs meet contacts from each service*
  - Let boroughs and emergency services know what targets they are required to make in short term*
  - Update strategic route maps*
  - Pass on any other information*
- *Those ES that have strategic route networks should give boroughs a copy*
- *While boroughs are entitled to place traffic calming schemes on these roads, because they are of high importance to emergency services alternative strategies should be considered and consultation should begin at the earliest possible stage*
- *Those boroughs who have maps/plans of current traffic calming schemes/one-way streets should make these available to the emergency services*
- *Emergency services should aim to return statutory consultations with feedback*
- *Boroughs should give emergency services adequate time to comment (a time limit of how long is needed to provide notice needs to be jointly agreed)*

#### 3.2 Seminar outcomes

##### 3.2.1 Statutory Consultations

Statutory consultations were an issue for all organisations. Where personal relationships were already good no problems were mentioned. However, where no personal relationships existed a number of problems occurred. On the side of the emergency services some people found that they were not being given a suitable length of time to reply to consultation notices (i.e. receiving a consultation letter two days before a closing date) or not receiving any consultation at all. On the

other hand boroughs said they experienced a degree of frustration where a continual standard objection to a scheme was given with no explanation and/or no alternative suggestion included. It was suggested that stock answers are given where consultation time is too short to consider each scheme on its own merits.

### 3.2.2 Traffic Liaison Meetings

Traffic Liaison meetings had varying degrees of success in different areas. Some boroughs found these a useful aid to liaison in conjunction with other methods. They were thought to be useful to have a point of contact and to flag up issues at an early stage. Police officers said that they generally had better liaison with boroughs that held these meetings than boroughs that didn't. The LAS appreciated the importance of these meetings but expressed frustration at their length and relevancy. One borough said they were phasing out these meetings as they were too inflexible to incorporate all issues. For example, they stated that they could have a meeting on one week but need to consult the emergency services a week later where unforeseen issues had been raised. In this borough meetings were now being fixed on more short term notice on a "need to know" basis.

The conclusion was that where traffic liaison meetings are working they should be continued. Whilst each borough has different amounts of time between meetings it seems that however often they are held works. Traffic liaison meetings should not be used alone to replace all other methods but should be used as an additional method of communication. A suggestion was raised that meetings could have a concise agenda consisting of matters that are specifically relevant to the emergency services who then could be excused from remainder of meeting.

### 3.2.3 An Annual Special Traffic Liaison Meeting

The idea of an annual special traffic liaison meeting was raised. This idea had positive feedback. Participants in the seminar were particularly keen with meeting face to face with other people, particularly in areas where there were no regular meetings. It was commented on that people should know each other if the regular traffic liaison meetings were attended. However a meeting where everybody was recommended to meet, with an agenda relevant to all, could spark better attendance for the regular meetings and better relations overall. Some boroughs produced a document with an overview of what the schemes may be included in the following year as well as time scale. The delivery of this document where it is used could coincide with an annual meeting.

### 3.2.4 Emergency Service Priority Routes

There was some confusion (as has been in all stages of this project) as to who had these routes. The police seemed not to have these, whereas the LFB and the LAS often did. One borough approached each of the emergency services for these. They received maps from the LFB and the LAS. The police said they were happy to use the recommendations from these services rather than produce their own as they are often on the road rather than working out of a station. This borough found these maps particularly useful in helping in decide where to use traffic calming devices. The only difficulty raised with these maps was that the details changed frequently.

### 3.2.5 Joint site visits

These had been found to be very useful in some places. It allowed organisations to see the difficulties of all sides. The issue of when these would be appropriate was raised. This type of exercise is time consuming and therefore people do not want to attend where it may not be relevant to them. It was thought that a criterion for when a site visit was needed could be created. This could be

a list of when a certain number of conditions occurred, a joint site visit would be highly recommended.

### 3.2.6 Workshops

An idea was raised that might be helpful if a workshop was held from time to time to allow borough engineers to discuss scheme types and their particular design and implementation issues with the LFB and LAS so that they are aware of the obstacles that must be overcome in order to implement new schemes.

### 3.2.7 Relationships

Personal communication was felt to be key to creating better relationships between the boroughs and the emergency services.

The boroughs noted that they found it easier to get hold of a road safety person in another borough than to get hold of an emergency services person in their own borough. They said this was partly because of the uniformity of the personnel systems across boroughs and the differences between boroughs and each emergency service. The police were said to be the easiest to reach with LFB and LAS being harder. However, the boroughs were aware of the difficulties for the emergency services in having enough time to attend to matters outside their primary responsibilities.

The LFB representatives said that each borough should have a nominated LFB officer to talk to. Similarly an LAS representative said there should be a person from the LAS for each borough but as this was only a small part of their responsibilities it was often difficult for them to attend/respond.

People from all the organisations present felt it was easier to communicate when they had a personal contact whom they knew. This made it easier to discuss new schemes or ideas at the earliest stages and to encourage feedback on any issues. Both the boroughs and the emergency services found difficulty in finding the right person to talk to. In many cases the person whom they dealt with was merely “*a name at the top of a letter*”. Once a good relationship was built across organisations it could easily deteriorate when an individual moved positions. When this occurred previously good relationships often diminished.

## **4. Recommendations for good practice**

The interviews, questionnaire and seminar all raised broadly similar issues regarding barriers and facilitators to more effective working. The seminar was particularly helpful in bringing issues out into the open and allowing all sides to discuss their particular problems. The recommendations presented here emanated from the wide ranging discussions at the seminar and as such should be broadly acceptable to the boroughs and emergency services across London.

There is a case for providing outside groups with information as early as is practicable. The earlier information is given out the more feedback is received, and the more likely a solution acceptable to all could be reached. The more often this occurs the more likely similarly good communication practices will occur again in the future. The more the boroughs and the emergency services communicate with each other the better the communication and the more effective their work. Where boroughs and emergency services have good relationships the methods they use should be continued. If traffic liaison meetings don't work well but other methods are used to communicate then there is no reason to force a strategy that doesn't fit the situation. These recommendations are suggestions for those who feel their communication could be improved.

### ***4.1 An Annual Special Traffic Liaison Meeting***

An annual traffic management meeting could be held by all boroughs. This meeting should be attended by at least one representative from each emergency service and by both road safety officers and engineers from a borough. The meeting would not replace future normal meetings or other methods of communication but be an additional event. The purpose of the meeting would be to:

1. Review how liaison has been working over the past year.
2. Discuss any ways in which methods could be revised.
3. Let each of the other organisations know of any new/continuous initiatives and targets that exist for them.
4. Revise the frequency of the regular traffic liaison meetings.
5. Revise the length of time currently given for statutory consultations.
6. Let the boroughs and emergency services meet face-to-face with the relevant contacts they correspond with during the year.
7. Introduce any new people who have joined within the year.
8. Update strategic route maps.
9. Update/check contact details of people.
10. Pass on any other relevant information.

One of the reasons for areas with previously good communication methods going downhill is changes to staff. This happens in all organisations. At staff changeover there needs to be good handover procedures in operation so that contact lists are passed on and introductions made. Whilst an annual meeting will help new staff meet these contacts personally, changes do occur in the interim and efforts should be made to make contacts during the year.

### ***4.2 Obtaining contacts***

A central resource, perhaps web based, giving out contact details for staff in each area of road safety could prove useful. Currently boroughs have websites where the public can access

information. Some of these websites have details of contacts in each department. Other organisations have relevant websites as well. The Local Authority Road Safety Officers Association (LARSOA) lists all the road safety officers for each authority in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. The London Fire Brigade website lists all the borough commanders and their contact details. These websites are listed in Appendix 4. These details and similar lists of contacts for the police and for the LAS could be listed on a central website accessible to those from the relevant organisations. If updated regularly by all this could be an easy way of quickly finding the relevant person with whom to talk.

### **4.3 Emergency Service Priority Routes**

Those emergency services that have strategic route networks should give boroughs a copy. Boroughs are entitled to place traffic calming schemes on these roads but because they are of high importance to emergency services alternative strategies should be considered and consultation should begin at the earliest possible stage.

On the part of the boroughs, those boroughs that have maps/plans of current traffic calming schemes/one-way streets should make these available to the emergency services. Whilst it would be useful if all boroughs had such plans, it is recognised that this does take time and resources. However, where plans are not available, it would be helpful for a list be created of roads with such schemes.

### **4.4 Statutory Consultations**

Emergency services should aim to return statutory consultations with feedback. If they disagree with a scheme then reasons and alternative suggestions would be helpful. Boroughs need to give emergency services time to comment (a time limit of how long is needed to provide notice needs to be jointly agreed by each individual area). Ideally once an issue has reached formal consultation stage, the emergency services should have already been made aware of it.

### **4.5 Joint Site Visits**

Joint site visits work well where they are used. Where there is time and the resources these could be used to find solutions where schemes are particularly complex or objections to them have been raised and alternative solutions need to be found. However, a site visit is not always appropriate for all emergency services. Perhaps a list of criteria for when a site visit is needed could be created.

### **4.6 Workshops**

One of the strongest messages to come out of the study is that the relationship between the LAS at a local level and the boroughs is often poor. From information gathered at all stages of the study there still appears to be a degree of tension over traffic calming schemes. It would be helpful if this could be brought out into the open at a workshop designed so that both sides can learn more about the operational needs of the other. The workshops, suggested at the seminar, could be broadened so that the boroughs, the police, the LFB and the LAS all put forward their operational difficulties.

## **4.7 Personal relationships**

The key issue to emerge from the study was that of personal relationships. Many of the people consulted felt that they had more effective liaison where they knew the people they were liaising with. Rather than only have letter or email contact with a person from another organisation good liaison includes having met people on more than one occasion and being comfortable enough to contact them outside of statutory requirements and planned meetings. One of the purposes of traffic liaison meetings is to build contacts through which information can be communicated between meetings. In this manner information would reach people before formal consultation.

However, where there is already poor communication it is even more difficult to foster positive relationships. For example, if the emergency service does not receive a consultation in time to comment it could be because the borough is not sending it to the correct person and it is getting stuck on the wrong person's desk who fails to pass it on in time. This highlights how important it is for the borough to know the correct person to send the consultation to.

When communication is poor there is a tendency of each party to have a negative image of the other. This makes it more difficult to find a way to start improving communication. Perhaps people from all groups need a central contact within the different organisations to break down the barriers that contribute to the poor communication. Some groups now have a central contact person currently putting this into practice.

Therefore, one of the most important facilitators to effective liaison is the creation and maintenance of personal relationships. This needs to be encouraged.

## **5. Conclusion**

This conclusion is in two parts. Firstly, it will look at the issues involved in carrying out the research. Secondly it will provide some further suggestions as to what the boroughs, the ALG, TfL and the emergency services can do to further encourage more effective liaison. It is important to note that these issues need to be raised and discussed at a top level as well as at a local level.

### **5.1 Conclusions of the research procedure**

#### **5.1.1 Contact and Awareness**

There was a lot of interest in the study from the boroughs and the emergency services. The exposure it received through the Pan London Safety Forum and the ALG helped raise its profile so that many people had already heard about the survey when they were contacted. Those that did respond were very positive and willing to help.

However, it was often very difficult to find the right person to talk to in the boroughs. We were fortunate to have a contact list which the ALG supplied. Whilst these were not necessarily the right people they should have been aware of the study by the time the questionnaires were sent out and been able to forward it to the correct person in their organisation. Contact by phone often meant having to go through four or five people before getting someone who could only "partly" help. Emails were often forwarded to people better placed to deal with the questionnaire than the contact person. However, the relevant person often did not respond. If we had such difficulties imagine how difficult it must be for the emergency services to find the right person.

The ALG asked us to try to contact as many non-responders in the boroughs as possible. We did this by resending the questionnaire to the original contacts and the ALG also sent out reminders to the non-responding boroughs. This brought forth about six more responses. Once the non-responders had had a chance to reply to the questionnaire we started telephoning them. To do this we needed to find the telephone numbers as we only had email addresses. This was rather time consuming. Once contact was made, we went through the questionnaire on the phone. This added a further six responses. In total 85 questionnaires were sent to the boroughs and by all methods, a total of 23 responses were obtained from the boroughs. This means that 9 boroughs did not respond at all and one responded after the analysis was complete.

The police were very easy to liaise with. The ALG gave us the two main contacts and both these people knew of the study beforehand. One of these arranged interviews, seminar attendance and questionnaire administration to all relevant officers. This was the reason that the response rate among the police was so high (20 questionnaires sent out and 18 replies received). The police place a lot of importance on traffic and safety matters and institutionally are well organised with respect to liaison with the boroughs. Although most dealings were through the two main contacts, some other officers who were aware of the study contacted us with additional information.

The ALG provided a contact for the London Ambulance Service (LAS). This contact sent the questionnaire on our behalf to the relevant people within LAS. We also sent the questionnaire to our own contacts within the LAS. In total 25 questionnaires were sent off and 9 were returned.

The ALG provided the two main contacts in the London Fire Brigade (LFB). However neither contact responded to any emails sent. Therefore the reliance of contact was on cold calling. We found contact details for the borough commanders through LFB website. However, overall the response from LFB, given their lack of awareness of the study, was satisfactory (39 questionnaires were sent out 10 responses were received).

### **5.1.2 Personal Relationships**

The main point learnt from the study was just how fragile the relationships between boroughs and emergency services are as well as how vital they are to efficient function. Ensuring continued face-to-face contact is key to maintaining positive useful relationships between these two groups.

A lack of attendance at traffic liaison meetings and a lack of comment in statutory consultations were mentioned in all stages of this study. This was usually mentioned by the boroughs in relation to the emergency services, particularly with reference to the LAS, and occasionally to the LFB as well. It is thought that this lack of attendance may play a major part in the relationships between the organisations. A way needs to be found to encourage attendance and therefore closer relationships. More effort needs to be made on all sides to make and maintain relationships. Perhaps the boroughs need to think about what information they want from the emergency services and then work towards making it easy for them to provide it.

One of the most useful aspects of the study was the seminar held towards the end of the study. This enabled us to see how information about the same issue was perceived by the different organisations. It also allowed different organisations to hear the barriers and difficulties experienced by others.

### **5.1.3 Time**

Essentially this was a big study that was packed into a small timeframe. Whilst the timing of this study was well managed the study could have yielded more in-depth information if the timescale had been longer.

The questionnaire had to be completed and returned in a short space of time. A few further replies were received after analysis had already begun. Whilst these could not be incorporated into the quantitative results their written answers were taken into account. Further time would have allowed for more responses to be received.

A larger study could produce more comprehensive results. While London boroughs are unique in the way that they are run it may have been helpful to examine the practices of local authorities outside of London. In this manner, more effective methods may have been found.

## **5.2. Further suggestions**

The seminar that was held as part of the study aimed to combine members from all groups so that opinions from all sides could be heard. This succeeded as a way of raising issues of what pressures and difficulties other groups faced in order to meet their targets. We would suggest that the ALG could organise similar styled informal workshops. The objective would be to hold 4 or 5 different workshops across London (perhaps North, South, East, West and Central) where people from boroughs and emergency services could meet and discuss what difficulties they face in the current systems and what ways they could work together to make it more effective. The purpose of such a workshop would be to reduce and diffuse tension between the groups, to encourage more open dialogue and to allow the groups to get a better understanding of the perspective of the other groups.

Good liaison between the boroughs and the LAS is vital to effective function and generally their current relationship is fragile. Currently it seems that the boroughs dictate how the emergency services communicate with them. It may be that part of the reason for the lack of satisfactory relationships with the LAS is that the LAS have not been involved in the way liaison is organised between themselves and the boroughs. The LAS needs to be encouraged to take a bigger role in deciding how it would be best for them to communicate with the boroughs. The ALG could ask to the LAS to suggest any changes to the way they currently communicate with the boroughs that could make liaison easier for them. In turn the ALG need to encourage the boroughs to be receptive to such suggestions.

## **6. References**

Capita Symonds (2004). Assessing the casualty reduction performance of local highway authorities. Road Safety Research Report No. 53. Department for Transport. September 2004

Featherstone, J. (2004). London's got the hump. A scrutiny on the impact of speed humps on Londoners' lives. Transport for London.

Shawcross, V. and Knight, K. (2005). The Draft London Safety Plan. LEFPA, London

## **7. Acknowledgements**

The study team would like to acknowledge the time, effort and interest of all those who agreed to be interviewed, attend the seminar and respond to the questionnaire. We would also like to thank Damian Price and Marisa Ker of the ALG for their help, interest and support.

## Appendices

### Appendix 1: Questionnaire

# Borough Liaison with Emergency Services

This is a questionnaire looking at the communication and liaison strategies between individual London boroughs and Emergency Services on road safety issues is part of a project by the Association of London Governments in conjunction with the Centre for Transport Studies, University College London.

The aim of the research project is to find better ways for boroughs and emergency services to work together, and it is not seeking to apportion blame to any party.

This questionnaire is for people whose job it is to liaise on road safety issues. The questionnaire looks at what makes the communication process between the groups difficult or easy. This will help us to contribute to making communication between local boroughs, police, ambulance, fire and other groups interested in local road safety more effective.

We have asked which borough you work for or liaise with. This is so that we know how wide a response we receive and so we can compare similar boroughs. However you will not be personally identifiable. Please do not put your name on this form.

Please return this questionnaire using the stamped self addressed envelope enclosed.

Thank you in advance for participating in this questionnaire.

If you have any questions or enquiries please contact Roselle on: 020 7679 1597 or [roselle@transport.ucl.ac.uk](mailto:roselle@transport.ucl.ac.uk)

## Section 1. General Information

1. Do you work for:

London borough     Ambulance Service

Fire Service     Police Service

Other    Please state

2. Which London borough(s) do you work in/ with?

## Section 2. Methods of Communication

There are lots of different of ways to communicate with other organisations. This section asks about some of the different ways you communicate with boroughs/emergency services.

3. Why do you communicate with boroughs/emergency services on road safety schemes? (tick all that apply)

Scheme consultations

Site visits

Traffic liaison meetings

One-off events

Other    (please specify)

4. Do you have a written policy for liaising with local council/emergency services?

Yes

No

5. What is your preferred method of communicating?

Mail

Phone call

Email

Meeting

Other    Please state

6. How often do you communicate with someone from your local council or the emergency services on road safety issues? Tick which fits best

- Daily       Twice weekly  
 Weekly       Monthly  
 Never

### **Statutory Requirements**

By law, boroughs are required to consult the emergency services on road safety schemes that are to be implemented. This section looks at how this consultation works.

If you work for the emergency services, please answer questions 7 to 11.

If you work for a borough please answer questions 12 to 16.

7. Are the consultation notices useful?

- Yes       No

8. What details do the consultation notices provide?

9. Do the consultation notices provide enough detail?

- Yes       No

10. If no, what details would you like the consultation notices to provide?

11. Are the consultation notices delivered with enough time for you to provide comment?

- Yes       No

12. Do you get feedback from the emergency services?

- Yes       No

13. If you get any feedback, is it useful?

- Yes       No

14. If yes, what sort of feedback do you get?

15. If you don't get any feedback, would some be useful?

Yes

No

16. If yes, what sort of feedback would you like and why?

### **Traffic Liaison Meetings**

Some boroughs hold traffic liaison meetings about traffic issues that they invite the emergency services and other relevant organisations to attend.

17. If you hold or attend a traffic liaison meeting how often do they occur?

Monthly

Every six weeks

Every two months

Every quarter

Less than every 3 months

18. If you hold or attend a traffic liaison meeting do they occur?

Too often

As often as is needed

Not often enough

19. If you hold or attend a traffic liaison meeting does it help in liaising with local borough/emergency services on road safety issues?

Yes

No

20. If you held or attended traffic liaison meetings in the past but they have ceased, why did this happen?

Not enough attendance

Not enough items to discuss

Other reason

Please state:

---

21. If you have or have had traffic liaison meetings how were they useful/not useful? Why?

### ***Emergency Service Priority Routes***

Some emergency services have fixed strategic routes through areas in order to reach their destinations. This is a road hierarchy of main roads, local distributor roads and access from service base stations to all parts of a town.

If you work for the emergency services please answer questions 22 to 24.

If you work for a London borough please answer questions 25 and 26.

22. Do you have emergency service priority routes?

- Yes                       No                       Don't know

23. If yes, do your corresponding local councils have a copy?

- Yes                       No                       Don't know

24. Is it beneficial/would it be beneficial for your corresponding local councils to have a copy?

- Yes                       No                       Don't know

25. Do you have copies of emergency service priority routes from:

- Ambulance                       Fire                       Police
- Don't know                       None

26. Is it beneficial/would it be beneficial to have a copy of emergency service priority routes from:

- Ambulance
                         
  Fire
                 
  Police  
 Don't know
                         
  None

**Site Visits**

27. Have you ever had joint visits to sites where schemes are being proposed?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> No schemes

28. If yes, when do these occur?

- On every scheme  
 On complex schemes  
 On schemes where a difficulty has been raised  
 Other

29. If you answered no to question 27 would joint site visits be useful?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------

### Section 3. Effectiveness

Please think about the day-to-day communication you have with your local council or with the emergency services. Please circle the number that is most appropriate: Strongly agree =1, Agree = 2, Neither agree nor disagree =3, Disagree = 4, Strongly disagree =5.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
30. The way we communicate needs to be improved	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
31. The amount of communication needs to be increased	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
32. The other organisation(s) need to communicate more within themselves	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
33. The other organisation(s) need to communicate more with us	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
34. There is a lot of communication	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
35. Suggestions we make are taken into consideration	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
36. I think the methods used for communication we are currently using need to be revised	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
37. I am satisfied with how we communicate	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
38. The other organisation(s) needs to give us more feedback	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
39. Our organisation(s) needs to communicate more within itself	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
40. Our organisation needs to communicate more with the other	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
41. organisation(s)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>
42. I think the communication and liaison strategies we have with the local council/emergency services are effective	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>

Finally,

43. Is there a method of communication that does or could occur between London boroughs and emergency services that has not been mentioned here and that could aid liaison?

**Comments**

Many thanks for completing this questionnaire. If there are aspects of liaison that you think are missing from this questionnaire or you want to add further comments please use the space provided below. I would also welcome comments on how I can make this survey easier to complete.

## Appendix 2: Summary of results given at March 10<sup>th</sup> seminar

### Traffic Liaison Meetings

- 89% of boroughs hold TLM
- Only 15% have these every month
- Generally held every 3 months (39%)
- Reasons for no longer having TLM– not enough attendance (58%)
- 98% of people felt that their TLM were beneficial
- 89% of people thought TLM were held as often as needed
- 9% thought they TLM were not held as often as needed

### Emergency Service Priority Routes

- 46% of Emergency service have ESPR
  - 16% did not know if they had them
- 29% of boroughs have ESPR from some or all emergency services
  - 50% have no ESPR
- 22% of emergency services have given copies to boroughs
- 93% of boroughs said ESPR from all services would be useful
- 80% of emergency services said it would be useful if boroughs had copies
- Emergency services want ESPR of other emergency services

### Statutory Consultations

- Emergency service responses
  - 100% said consultations useful
  - 82% consultations have enough detail
  - 79% received with enough time to comment
- Borough responses
  - 87% said they received some feedback (not from all groups)
  - 96% said the feedback they received was useful
  - 100% of those who didn't get feedback said some would be useful

### Joint Site Visits

- 58% of responses said they had completed joint site visits
  - 57% of these held site visits when difficulties had been raised
  - 25% of these held them on complex schemes
- 71% of people who didn't have site visits said they would be beneficial

### General Effectiveness

- The less general communication there was the more likely people were to want more communication with the other organisations
- Most people felt their suggestions were being listened to
- 53% felt the other organisation(s) needed to communicate more internally

- 51% felt their own organisation need to communicate more internally
- 37% felt their own organisation needed to communicate more with the other organisations
- 51% wanted more feedback
- I am satisfied with how we communicate
  - 54% “agreed” or “strongly agreed”
  - 21% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”
- The way we communicate needs to be improved
  - 43% “agreed” or “strongly agreed”
  - 24% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed”
- More methods of communication used the more effective communication is
  - Less methods – more need for improvement
  - Less methods – less communication
  - More methods – more feedback

Conclusions from interviews and questionnaire

- Type and style of liaison differs across London
- Communication has improved
- People still want communication levels to improve
- Those people who communicate more are happier with liaison

### Appendix 3: Summary of analysis of statements

Questionnaire Statements		N	Mean	Std. Dvtn	Statistical Significance
I think the methods used for communication we are currently using need to be revised	All methods	10	3.60	.843	
	Some methods	51	3.04	.916	
The way we communicate needs to be improved	All methods	11	3.36	.924	t=2.322(61), p<.05
	Some methods	52	2.63	.950	
The amount of communication needs to be increased	All methods	10	3.50	.850	t=2.496(58), p<.05
	Some methods	50	2.82	.774	
There is a lot of communication	All methods	10	2.10	.738	t=-2.993(59), p<.01
	Some methods	51	2.90	.78	
I think the communication and liaison strategies we have with the local council/emergency services are effective	All methods	10	2.30	.675	
	Some methods	50	2.64	.776	
The other organisation(s) need to communicate more within themselves	All methods	9	3.11	.782	t=2.684(59), p<.01
	Some methods	52	2.37	.768	
The other organisation(s) need to communicate more with us	All methods	10	3.40	.699	t=3.244(59), p<.01
	Some methods	51	2.51	.809	
The other organisation(s) needs to give us more feedback	All methods	10	3.10	.738	t=2.569(59), p<.05
	Some methods	51	2.43	.755	
Our organisation needs to communicate more with the other organisation(s)	All methods	10	3.20	.789	
	Some methods	50	2.84	.817	
Our organisation(s) needs to communicate more within itself	All methods	10	2.60	.966	
	Some methods	49	2.70	.918	
Suggestions we make are taken into consideration	All methods	9	2.11	.601	
	Some methods	51	2.53	1.007	
I am satisfied with how we communicate	All methods	10	2.30	.823	
	Some methods	51	2.71	.923	

## Appendix 4: Internet addresses

- Road Safety Officers:  
[http://www.larsoa.org.uk/rso\\_contact.htm](http://www.larsoa.org.uk/rso_contact.htm)
- London Fire Brigade:  
[http://www.london-fire.gov.uk/contact\\_us/borough\\_teams.asp](http://www.london-fire.gov.uk/contact_us/borough_teams.asp)
- London Ambulance Service:  
<http://www.londonambulance.nhs.uk>

## Appendix 5: List of respondents

### Police Boroughs:

Croydon / Bromley	Kingston / Hammersmith	Hounslow / Richmond
Southwark / Lewisham	Brent / Barnet	Camden / Islington
Kensington	Wandsworth / Sutton	Merton / Lambeth
Greenwich / Bexley	Hillingdon / Ealing	Westminster
Hackney / Redbridge / Waltham Forest	Havering / Braking / Newham	Harrow
Corp of London / Islington / Hackney / Tower Hamlets / Southwark / Westminster		

### LAS areas:

Lewisham / Greenwich	Bexley	Hounslow / Richmond
Barking / Havering	Lambeth	Camden
Haringey / Enfield	Croydon	Ealing

### LFB areas:

Southwark	Hillingdon	Haringey
Westminster	Kingston	Hounslow
Croydon	Tower Hamlets	
Ealing	Havering	

### Boroughs:

Barnet	Tower Hamlets	Kensington
Enfield	Wandsworth	Havering
Croydon	Redbridge	Merton
Bromley	Newham	Greenwich
Hammersmith	Hillingdon	Harrow
Hackney	Camden	Islington
Brent	Hounslow	Richmond
Lewisham	Sutton	

## **Appendix 6: List of organisations attending the seminar**

### List of attendee organisations

London Borough of Bexley  
London Borough of Camden  
London Borough of Croydon  
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham  
London Borough of Kensington and Chelsea  
London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
Metropolitan Police (four attendees)  
London Ambulance Service (two attendees)  
London Fire Brigade (three attendees)