
Executive

30 March 2010

Report of the Director of City Strategy

Camera Enforcement Project Summary Report.

Summary

1. This paper provides a summary of the study, undertaken by the Road Safety Partnership 95 Alive, on the feasibility of Camera Enforcement. The full report is available as a background paper.
2. It gives an overview of the work that has been carried out to assess the possibility of using Safety Cameras in reducing casualties, across York and North Yorkshire and explains how collaborative work, between North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) City of York Council (CYC), North Yorkshire Police (NYP), under the 95 Alive banner, has led to these conclusions and recommendations.
3. It is important to note that the project brief was to explore the use of Safety Cameras to reduce casualties.
4. Two options are set out in the paper, firstly to “agree in principle” to camera enforcement as a casualty reduction measure. This agreement is required to proceed to a full business case and trial pilot, of one camera van. Or secondly, to continue to reduce casualties using the established mix of education, engineering and enforcement and thus not to “agree in principle” to safety cameras.

Background

5. In 2000 the government published its 10 year Road Safety Strategy “Tomorrows Roads – Safer for Everyone”. This strategy set out challenging casualty reduction targets to be achieved by the end of 2010. This included the introduction of a “cost recovery” programme for speed and red light camera enforcement which was subsequently re-titled the National Safety Camera Programme.
6. The National Safety Camera Programme was a scheme whereby fixed penalty receipts from offences detected by speed and red light cameras were used to cover the costs of camera installation and operation at identified collision sites. Thus the offending motorists directly paid for the cost of enforcement of speed limits at these camera sites. The pilot scheme of eight

local authority areas commenced in 2000. Following enabling legislation in April 2001, the programme was expanded and was eventually adopted by all but three Local Highway Authorities (LHA) these being County Durham, North Yorkshire and the City of York and by every police force with the exceptions of Durham Constabulary and North Yorkshire Police.

7. The National Safety Camera Programme required that each area partnership between police, LHA, Courts Service and other stakeholders comply with the rules, guidance and criteria for safety camera installation and operation as laid down by the Department for Transport (DfT). This was to ensure a consistent approach across the country. Each partnership was required to produce an annual business case, for DfT, in which proposed enforcement sites were assessed under the approved criteria. DfT required this as a pre-requisite to the release of funding from the penalty fines.
8. In 2003, an investigation into the feasibility of using safety camera enforcement under this national programme was undertaken by City of York Council (CYC), North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) and North Yorkshire Police (NYP). The decision was taken not to participate at that time.
9. In November 2004, the 95 Alive York and North Yorkshire Road Safety Partnership was established. The partner authorities and agencies agreed to cooperate and work together towards a shared aim of saving an additional 95 lives, over and above those to be saved by achieving the governments 2010 targets.
10. In 2007 the National Safety Camera Programme was brought to an end in favour of a new funding arrangement which broke the direct connection between funding of camera enforcement and the fines paid by offenders. The new arrangement was for a new Road Safety Grant paid direct to every LHA by the DfT, whether or not they operated safety cameras. At the same time the rules and guidance for safety camera operations were relaxed, insofar as each partnership was permitted to adjust the site selection criteria to suit local conditions and requirements. Some partnerships did make changes at this point and others did not.
11. This new Grant was designated for use in casualty reduction work undertaken on a partnership basis. It could be used to fund camera enforcement operations, road safety education, training and publicity programmes, engineering works, other enforcement operations and any combination of these with the aim of reducing casualties. It was to be used specifically through the various agencies working together in partnership. The amount of the Grant to each LHA was calculated by looking at casualty data from the years 1994 – 98 and setting targets for reduction to be achieved by 2010.

12. The current funding arrangements from the DfT, the Road Safety Grant, paid direct to Local Authorities is due to finish in March 2011. As yet no directive has been given, as to if there will be any direct funding of Road Safety from the DfT after March 2011. Fig 1 below, gives a breakdown of the Grant allocated to CYC.

Fig.1 Specific Road Safety Grant Allocation for City of York Council.

£s	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
Capital	44868	43830	43166	42493
Revenue	201654	196990	194008	190981
Total	246522	240820	237174	233474

13. The next DfT Road Safety strategy, “A Safer Way”, sets the policy on casualty reduction from 2011 onwards for the next 10 or even 20 years. “A Safer Way”, was sent out for consultation in the summer of 2009 and the final version is due for release, sometime in 2010.

14. In June 2008, as part of a wider partnership approach to Speed Management, the 95 Alive Partnership Steering Group decided to reassess the potential benefits of adopting camera enforcement as a casualty reduction measure. An initial review indicated that there were a number of sites and routes where additional reductions in crashes and casualties could be achieved. The partnership commissioned a project team, comprised of one officer from of the following organisations, NYCC, CYC & NYP.

15. They were to investigate, what the accident criteria might be, and if there were any locations within the region that may benefit from safety cameras to reduce casualties. The feasibility of such operations and the potential costs entailed and casualty reduction benefits they might offer. In March 2009 a Project Manager was assigned to support the Project team.

Safety Camera Feasibility Study.

16. The first priority of the team was to assess best practice, by investigating other Safety Camera Partnerships. It was clear from the assessment undertaken that many had “evolved” into working partnerships. This gave the opportunity to learn from others mistakes. The benchmarking highlighted that a starting point was required, in terms of criteria, from which an agreed set of principles could be built, to give a robust framework for casualty reduction. This framework can then be used to provide a flexible approach to camera enforcement, whilst ensuring that cameras are used principally to reduce casualties at locations where speed is a cause of accidents.

Identifying Core sites

17. After reviewing a number of options for criteria, it was decided to adhere closely to the DfT guidance for site selection for use of Camera Enforcement. The most up to date accident data available was used, which related to the years 2006 – 2008. The 2 causation factors that link directly to speed were used for core site identification (shown below in **fig 2**). This ensures that, as a priority, camera enforcement would be at locations where, as a direct consequence of speed, serious accidents are being caused.

Fig.2

Causation Factors Used	
306	Exceeding speed limit
307	Travelling too fast for conditions

18. The results from this work identified that there were currently no sites in York or North Yorkshire that warranted fixed or red light safety cameras. However a total of 28 sites did meet the criteria for use of mobile safety cameras, 3 within the City of York boundary. These 28 sites are potentially where camera enforcement, could reduce speed related casualties. All 28 sites are subject to further investigation before final confirmation. The full report estimates that this could potentially equate to the saving of 31 killed or seriously injured, over a 4 year period, should camera enforcement be chosen as the way forward.
19. These 28 locations would provide the core sites where camera enforcement would, initially be targeted. However, if camera enforcement is adopted, part of the operation would be an annual review of the latest data to identify any newly emerging places and problems. More sites may develop and emerge and some of these could be more effectively addressed by the use of fixed, permanent cameras or by red light cameras. The adoption of a wider set of contributory factors might also increase the number of places where camera enforcement might then be considered. This would be a matter of policy for consideration and agreement between the partners. A monitoring methodology would be required to assess the effectiveness of camera operations. A discontinuation policy would also be required to enable camera operations to be reduced or discontinued if they were no longer needed. The detailed criteria is documented in **Annex A**.

Identifying Exceptional Sites

20. DfT guidance allows, under certain circumstances, for safety cameras to be used at locations other than at identified core sites. These are called exceptional sites, and are defined by the DfT as:-
- “Sites that have not been approved as core sites but where partnerships are undertaking speed camera enforcement for reasons that may include:*
- Community concern – where the local community requests the partnership to enforce at a particular site because traffic speeds there are causing concern for road safety*
- Collision frequency – where a site has a high incidence of personal injury collisions (PIC), but insufficient killed or seriously injured (KSI) collisions to meet the criteria, but where there is well founded concern that a failure to reduce speeds or red light running at this site will result in future increases in KSI collisions, including fatalities*
- Engineering factors – where collisions are occurring and an engineering solution has been identified, but cannot be implemented in the short term.*
- It is most unlikely that there will be exceptional sites on roads with 70mph speed limits unless there is a clear and compelling road safety reason, based on a casualty or collision history.”*

21. This definition has been adapted to reflect the local needs for York and North Yorkshire. All community concerns/complaints will need an evaluation to determine the most appropriate course of action priority. In York, this will be managed through the Speed Review Process.
22. Camera enforcement will only be used at community concern sites, where there is clear evidence that speeds are significantly above the speed limit, as agreed with North Yorkshire Police, and where every other cost effective measure has been considered and are unsuitable
23. Exceptional sites will also include locations where North Yorkshire Police request their use for special operations, this will be through an approval process, defined in the full business case. (Yet to be undertaken). A flow chart of exceptional site selection is shown in **Annex B**.
24. DfT also recommend that;-
“To maintain the focus on casualty reduction at core sites, enforcement time at exceptional sites must not exceed 15% of the total number of live camera hours at core sites. The 15% of time is a maximum limit and should not be seen as a target to meet and a clear audit trail will be undertaken to evidence time spent at core sites and time spent at exceptional sites.”
25. The DfT criteria was agreed on, by the project team, as a compromise to reach agreement between the Partner Organisations who all had differing views on exceptional sites. More work on how exceptional sites will be managed between the Partner Organisations will be undertaken, if it is agreed to move onto full business case, however it is possible that any exceptional sites in York, where camera enforcement takes place would need to be funded by CYC in addition to the pro-rata core site enforcement.
26. Although there are only 3 core sites that fall within the boundary of York, the fact that most residents, commuters and visitors, do drive around the region and the uncertainty caused by having exceptional sites does mean that having safety cameras should act as a general deterrent to speeding.

The Cost of a Safety Camera Partnership

27. Based on the 28 identified mobile enforcement sites, a two vehicle enforcement unit has been assessed as being required to provide an appropriate and efficient level of enforcement.
28. The anticipated costs for setting up and annual running costs of a two vehicle camera enforcement unit and associated evidence and fixed penalty notice processing, investigation and prosecution costs have been estimated and are shown below in **Fig 3**.

Fig. 3 - Estimated set up and annual running costs for a two vehicle unit and associated process costs.

	Using Police Officers £k	Using civilian staff £k
Set up	890	810
Annual Operating Cost	677	581
Total set up plus first three years running costs	2,921	2,553
Total set up plus first 4 year running costs	3,598	3,134
Cost to CYC estimated at 10%	360	310

29. This is an outline estimate but does not include all costs as some would need to be quantified in the production of a full business case e.g. accommodation, software licences, road signage where and if required. These would need to be calculated in detail within a full business case. Other items may cost less once procurement processes and tenders were undertaken.

30. A decision on whether the Safety Camera Operators / Technicians should be police officers or civilian staff will form part of the business case. Below is an outline of some of the factors for consideration.

- Civilian and/or police officers – as Camera operators/ technicians
- Employee costs, police vs. civilian
- Chief Constables delegated powers/additional operation capability
- Potential abstractions police vs. civilian (for mandatory training, to other duties, in emergencies)
- Public perception / public reassurance, police vs. civilian

31. If all 28 sites are enforced using mobile cameras, the estimated saving over 4 years would be 31 killed or seriously injured (KSI). Although it is far from ideal to count this human suffering in financial terms, DfT do provide standard tables for calculating possible financial benefits of reducing casualties. If KSI's were reduced by 31, this could represent a financial saving of £10.35m. This represents a four year rate of return of 288%.

32. It is anticipated that costs of set up and running of a Safety Camera Partnership will be met by the two Local Authorities, within the partnership, NYCC and CYC, on a pro rata basis. How these costs are to be split has not yet been determined, or agreed. As the focus is on casualty reduction, officers have, however, had discussions on the split being built around the ratio of core sites. As approximately 10% fall within CYC, officers have estimated the costs to CYC at 10% for an initial indication of costs.

33. Thus total set up, and running costs of between £3.1 – £3.6 million pounds, could require a possible, CYC input (estimated at 10%) between £310 – £360k over the 4 years to set up and run the Camera Partnership.

Funding a Safety Camera Partnership

34. Decisions would need to be made as to how safety cameras would be funded in the future. For the year 2010/11 Road Safety Grant funding, currently received by NYCC & CYC could be used. (see **Fig.1**)

35. From April 2011, no clear indication has been given by DfT as to what, if anything is to replace the Road Safety Grant. For a camera partnership to go ahead would almost certainly require the cessation or reduction of some of the road safety education, training and publicity (ETP), currently being undertaken. It is highly unlikely that funds will be available for safety cameras and the level of ETP that has occurred over the last 3 years with the use of the road safety grant.

36. It is difficult to calculate a figure or value for the injuries and fatalities prevented by these mostly medium to long term ETP programmes. The DfT emphasises the importance and effectiveness of education and publicity programmes in influencing and changing the behaviour of road users to reduce collisions and consequent injuries. Hence the provision of an education, training and publicity service has been a statutory duty for LHA's since The Road Traffic Act of 1998 and is expected to form a major part of the governments imminent "A Safer Way" Road Strategy.

37. Although there is the potential benefit, from camera enforcement to protect an additional 31 people from being killed or seriously injured over four years with an estimated financial value of £10.35m it is not clear how this would be offset by any cessation of ETP work. This is because it is difficult to evidence any direct link between reduction in casualties and ETP work. So many other factors would need to be considered, such as level of enforcement, engineering, car design and even the state of the economy and weather can play a part. However, DfT do make it clear that ETP work is considered to be an important factor in the reduction of casualties.

Speed Awareness Courses

38. The Speed Awareness Course is a nationally delivered educational programme that can be offered to first time, low end, speeding offenders.

39. The course is demanding and requires each driver/rider to discover the effects and implications of breaking the speed limit in a robust but constructive way. It offers an intelligent approach to those who have been caught exceeding the speed limit.

40. The course provides an alternative to prosecution. The driver will be offered the option of accepting an endorsable fixed penalty notice for the offence or they may opt to pay for, and undertake a speed awareness course.

41. This option of an educational course for some, first time offenders, would form part of any camera enforcement programme offered through the Partnership. A percentage of income, from speed awareness courses, could be used by the Partnership to fund its initiatives, but this would need further exploration through the business case and pilot.

Business Case

42. If it is decided by all organisations in the partnership to agree “in principle” to the use of safety cameras then the first action would be to build a business case. This would take approx 6 month and cost an estimated £116.2k a cost which would need to be shared proportionately between NYCC and CYC. (this is included in the total costing shown earlier in **fig 3**.) At a possible 10 percent, CYC contribution could be £11.6k input into the business case in the financial year 2010/11. This costing is inclusive of dedicated staff, who would be recruited by the lead partner (NYCC) for this purpose, but would be overseen by the 95 Alive Partnership.

Evaluated Pilot

43. In view of the potential cost of a camera unit, the current financial situation and uncertainty of future funding, it would be appropriate to undertake an evaluated pilot operation. This should be a smaller scale, single vehicle with a single crew seconded from NYP. This should be line managed and supported by the Roads Policing Unit with operational oversight through the 95 Alive Partnership. A lower limit of 5% of time allocated to exceptional sites is proposed, to sites identified and assessed through the pilot Speed Management area in York. This pilot operation would be funded from the Road Safety Grants of both CYC and NYCC on a pro rata basis. An evaluation of these operations would be undertaken and reported through the Partnership after 12 months. This pilot would provide evidence of the effectiveness of camera operations in York and North Yorkshire prior to full financial commitment. The cost of this 12 month pilot is estimated to be approximately £250k, an estimated 10% input from CYC would be £25k.
44. No date has been set for the start of this pilot, as funds will not be released until an “agreement in principle” is achieved from elected Members, representing both CYC and NYCC, but should agreement in principle be reached by both LHA’s then it is anticipated the pilot will happen in 2010/11.
45. The cost, to CYC of the business case and pilot scheme together, estimated at 10% of the total cost would be a minimum of £36.6k in the financial year 2010/11.
46. This could be met from the Road Safety Grant allocation for 2010/11. But as no DfT decision has been taken past March 2011 alternative arrangements for funding for set up and running costs, after that date, would need to be identified.

Cost Benefit Analysis

47. As explained above, if safety camera enforcement were to be agreed on, and take place at the identified 28 locations the cost, over 4 years is estimated to

be £3.1 - £3.6m. The saving, of a possible 31 killed or serious accidents, by the use of cameras to reduce casualties equates to a saving of £10.35m. This represents a four year rate of return of 288%

48. However it should be noted that current practices means the 95 Alive Partnership is well placed to achieve and to exceed both the government set 2010 casualty reduction targets and its additional self imposed stretched targets of an extra 95 lives saved by 2010 without the use of this type of safety camera.
49. This is being achieved through a combination of coordinated enforcement, publicity, education, training and engineering work. This has demonstrated real added value and is clearly more effective than earlier uncoordinated efforts by individual agencies.
50. The full feasibility report suggests that over a four year period from 2007, if 95 KIS's are prevented (the target set out by the Regional Partnership 95 Alive) then the investment of £9.265m could have significantly contributed to a possible casualty saving of *£160m (**given as a value of prevention using figures provided from DfT Road Casualties Great Britain 2008*).
51. In York, DfT targets for reduction in "slight" accidents are well on track. Over recent years our KSI, and child KSI figures have fluctuated, this is in part, due to the small figures involved, but the trend is down. A summary of York's figures is given below, in **fig 4**. with an unconfirmed estimation for 2009 as they are still subject to validation by North Yorkshire Police.

Fig.4 Actual Casualty figures, as reported via Police Stats 19, for CYC.

Actual Casualties	KSIs	Slights	Child KSIs
Baseline 1994 -98	137	697	14
Year	Actual	Actual	Actual
1994 -98	137	697	14
2001	119	773	12
2002	120	715	16
2003	100	729	7
2004	114	719	16
2005	101	651	7
2006	161	590	12
2007	93	584	4
2008	95	505	7
2009 (estimated figs)	60 (provisional)	554 (provisional)	10 (provisional)
2010			
Targets 2010	75	627	7

Governance

52. The existing 95 Alive Partnership is insufficient to enable the full management of a camera enforcement unit. This is because it has been a simple agreement of mutual support and partnership work, but does not have the constitution required for a Safety Camera Partnership. It would need to be renegotiated and a more detailed agreement drawn up between the partners. This work has already started, as the current 95 Alive Partnership was designed to run to the end of the Road Safety Strategy “ Tomorrow’s Roads – Safer for Everyone” which is coming to an end in 2010. Should an agreement in principle be reached in favour of safety camera’s more work would be done on this, to get the partnership governance, fit for purpose, through the business case.
53. A number of governance and management models were considered, these included contracting out and other forms of single agency or shared management. The recommended model is for the Partnership Steering Group, which includes a CYC representative, to provide strategic governance with regular operational and financial oversight being the responsibility of identified partners from within the 95 Alive, Officer Working Group, which includes a CYC representative. Day to day management would be conducted by a Project Manager who should be independently appointed by the Partnership. This governance should also include Service Level Agreements or similar to ensure the expected and agreed commitment offered by each partner agency and an exit strategy should one or more partner agency decide to withdraw from the partnership or in the event of its cessation for whatever reasons.

Conclusions of the feasibility study

54. That the adoption of the recommended level of camera enforcement operations as part of a structured partnership approach to casualty reduction is expected to prevent the death or serious injury of an extra 31 people over four years at camera enforcement sites, across York and North Yorkshire.
55. That the establishment of a camera enforcement unit under the recommended site selection criteria and proposed governance model would be an efficient and cost effective additional casualty reduction measure.

Consultation

56. To understand the view of residents of York, questions about Safety Cameras are to be asked in a Talkabout questionnaire, the results of which are due back in April 2010.
57. Similar questions have already been asked by NYCC and the results showed 70% of residents in the NYCC area supported Safety Cameras.
58. Other Partner Organisations, NYCC and NYP also have their respective political processes to go through to reach “agreement in principle”. The feasibility study has already highlighted that these Organisations often have differing views on various aspects of the study. This could have an outside

impact on whether or not an “agreement in principle” is reached. NYCC have already started their political process, but will not reach a final decision on “agreement in principle” until May 2010.

59. Should NYCC make the decision, NOT “to agree in principle” to safety camera’s then this would seriously alter any further work done towards a Camera Partnership and Unit.

Options

Option 1

60. To agree, in principle to camera enforcement as a casualty reduction measure, with further evidence being provided through the business case and pilot study.

Option 2

61. To continue to reduce casualties using the established mix of education, enforcement and engineering. And thus not to agree in principle to camera enforcement as a casualty reduction measure, at this time.

Analysis

Option 1.

62. To agree in principle to safety cameras and to begin a business case and pilot scheme, to lead to a newly formed Safety Camera Enforcement Unit, governed by collaboration of key partners.
63. The cost of set up and running of a Camera Partnership for 4 years would be a total of £3.1 – 3.6m.
64. The partnership would be funded on a pro-rata basis, as part of an overall agreement on speed management. This would require a new Governance and a revised Memorandum of Understanding be adopted to enable camera enforcement operations to be undertaken by and on behalf of the Partnership.
65. Currently there are potentially 28 sites across York and North Yorkshire that have been identified as meeting the criteria for mobile speed enforcement to reduce speed related casualties. Of these 3 are within the York boundary. All 28 sites are subject to further investigation before final confirmation.
66. Before a Camera Partnership can be set up a business case and pilot would be required, at an estimated cost of £366k. If York’s estimated input to the business case and pilot is assumed to be 10% of the total cost (No final partnership agreement on funding split has yet been agreed), then £36k would be required. Funding is available, through the DfT specific road safety grant for the year 2010/11 to fund the £36k required for a business case and trial pilot.
67. There is the possibility that the introduction by NYP of Speed Awareness Courses, could off set some costs of Road Safety Camera Partnership, however this needs to be more thoroughly explored via the business case and pilot project.

68. Although only 3 of the core sites are within York, exceptional sites can also be considered for enforcement, if they fit the criteria. North Yorkshire Police, will also be able to request camera use on special operations.
69. The 28 sites are the locations where it can be evidenced that serious accidents are happening, which can be directly attributed to speed. It is right and proper that these locations are priority if a Camera Enforcement Unit were to be established. It is estimated that 31 serious or fatal injuries could be saved, over the first 4 years. However, this would be a starting position for the Unit. It is anticipated that after establishment, regular assessment of criteria and sites would take place and that a wider set of contributory factors could be considered which may increase the number of places for camera enforcement. This would be a matter of policy for consideration and agreement between partners.
70. It is anticipated that education training and publicity work in road safety may need to be reduced or ceased, in order to fund a Safety Camera Partnership but it is unclear how this cessation of work may impact on casualty figures.
71. In order to fulfil our statutory duty, and deliver the next road safety strategy "A Safer Way" some level of education, training and publicity in road safety will also need to be maintained.

Option 2

72. Would mean the continuation of education, training, publicity, engineering and enforcement to help reduce casualties in York and North Yorkshire. Also to continue to strengthen the working partnership with 95 Alive which could help reduce casualties even further through regional initiatives.
73. Current practices means that the 95 Alive Partnership is well placed to achieve and exceed both the government set 2010 casualty reduction targets and it's additional self imposed stretched targets of an extra 95 lives saved by 2010 without the use of this type of safety camera. In York, targets can fluctuate, in part due to the small numbers, but the trend is down.
74. Road Safety Education, Training and Publicity (ETP) has been heavily subsidised by government grant since 2007. This grant is due to end in March 2011. Funding for ETP will need to be found after March 2011, if the 95 Alive Partnership and CYC wish to maintain current levels, afforded by the DfT grant. It is a statutory duty of the LHA to provide ETP and it is expected to form a major part in the governments new 10 year road safety strategy "A Safer Way".
75. With the DfT specific road safety grant due to end in March 2011. No funding for York's input of the £3.1 – 3.6 million required to set up and run the Camera Partnership has been identified after March 2011.

Corporate Priorities

76. The Council's Corporate Strategy aim is to increase the use of public and other environmentally friendly modes of transport is relevant to this report. Fears of being a casualty are a real deterrent to more people walking and in particular cycling. By implementing a robust programme of speed management measures to reduce excessive speeding, which targets the minority of drivers whose driving behaviour poses the greatest risk to others, overall safety can be improved and an increase in active transport use achieved. The recommendations therefore support the Safer City and Sustainable City priorities.

Implications

Financial

77. Whilst cost for a business case and pilot scheme for 1 year could be met, by the DfT, Specific Road Safety Grant, (approx. 10% in put from York of £36.6k) which is only available until March 2011, other set up and running costs, for at least the first 4 years, estimated at approx £310k – £360k would need to be identified.

Fig 5.

	Overall Cost	Possible estimated (at 10%) cost to CYC.
Business Case	£116.2k	£11.6k
Pilot Scheme	£250k	£25k
Total Set up and running costs for 4 years	£3.1m - £3.6m	£310k - £360k

78. Whilst funding can be identified for 2010/11 through the Road Safety Grant, there is no guaranteed funding available after this date. Members are aware that the Medium Term Financial Strategy shows significant budgetary pressures in future years and need to take account of these consequences when committing to a pilot.

Human Resources (HR)

79. Human Resources issues would be undertaken by the lead partner, NYCC

Equalities

80. There are no equality implications.

Legal

81. As speeding, and the enforcement through cameras is a legal act, and tickets will be served through the crown prosecution service, there is the possibility that the Partnership, and the members of the partnership will have legal challenges brought against them. It is for this reason that a robust Partnership Governance Framework is recommended. That membership to Road Safety Support (RSS) has been included in the costing. All challenges will in the first instance be managed by the Safety Camera Enforcement Unit.

Crime and Disorder

82. Speeding is a criminal offence and the Council has a responsibility to deliver an effective Speed Management Strategy, which could include membership of a Safety Camera Partnership.

Information Technology (IT)

83. New technology is used in modern day camera enforcement, but the Partnership, and those employed with in it to run the Camera Partnership should be able to manage any IT issues. There could be issues with the sharing of sensitive data and information which is why is one of the reasons for having NYP take an active role in the delivery of the service on the ground.

Property

84. Property will be in the ownership of the Partnership and will be purchased via the lead authorities(NYCC) Procurement process

Other

85. There are no other implications.

Risk Management

86. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy the risks arising from the recommendations have been assessed as scoring less than 16. This does require frequent monitoring, but this will happen through the business case and pilot, and through regular operational and financial oversight from the 95 Alive Officer Working Group.
87. There could be potential strategic issues, if we as a Council are unable to meet our required road safety casualty reduction targets. The recommendations of the report should contribute to the mitigated risks that could save lives and avoid serious injury.
88. Road accidents by their very nature are unpredictable and it is always possible that an injury accident will occur on a route that has been assessed where no action or enforcement was taken. The data led method of assessing locations ensures that routes with a casualty record are prioritised.
89. There are financial issues, as although funding can be identified from the Specific Road Safety Grant for the business case and pilot scheme, there is no identified income stream for the set up and running costs of a Safety Camera Unit. Although some costs could be offset by income generated by the Speed Awareness Courses, at this present time, it is unclear how much this might be.
90. There is also a risk to our Organisation, in that other organisations, NYCC and NYP join the partnership and we do not, or visa versa.
91. There is a certain amount of reputational risk associated with the use of safety camera's. In order to minimise this, total set up and running costs includes membership to Road Safety Support (RSS) which is a "not for profit" organisation, supported and affiliated to the Association of Chief Police

Officers (ACPO). The organisation provides comprehensive and specialist support services to road safety partnerships and is in effect an insurance policy in case of extended or unusual legal challenges.

Recommendations

The Executive is asked to:

92. To agree, in principle to camera enforcement as a casualty reduction measure.
93. To proceed to full business case to enable a camera enforcement unit to be established under the recommended site selection criteria and governance model.
94. To agree that a smaller scale pilot camera enforcement operation be established and operate for 12 months to evaluate its effectiveness and inform a final decision at the end of the trial period. As yet no date for the commencement of a trial can be given, as “agreement in principle” is required from both CYC and NYCC before funding can be released for the trial to commence.
95. Request officers to bring a further report, after the business case and pilot, for a final decision on continuation of, and implementation of a Safety Camera Partnership.
96. To note the pilot would be run using Police staff, seconded to the role and line managed through NYP with operational oversight through the 95 Alive partnership. For full management of a Safety Camera Partnership, new governance arrangements would be required.

Reason - This is because analysis of the data, across the whole of York and North Yorkshire, indicates there are locations where safety camera technology could reduce speed related, serious and fatal injury accidents. Further work is required to finalise the detail of how a partnership might work within North Yorkshire and York.

Authors:	Chief Officer Responsible for the report:		
Trish Hirst Road Safety Officer City Strategy 01904 551331	Richard Wood Assistant Director (City Development and Transport)		
Ruth Stephenson Head of Transport Planning	Report Approved	√	Date 18/3/10
Specialist implications Officer(s)			
Financial Patrick Looker Finance Manager, City Strategy 01904 551633			
Wards affected			All √
For further information please contact the author of the report			

Background Papers

Full Camera Enforcement Project Report, from 95 Alive.

Annexes

Annex A – Criteria used for assessing core sites.

Annex B - Criteria for establishing an exceptional sites.