



ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE – 5th NOVEMBER 2020

COMMUNITY SPEED ENFORCEMENT INITIATIVE

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT

Purpose of Report

1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Committee of the outcome of the average speed camera trial and its resulting proposed Community Speed Enforcement Initiative (CSEI) that will continue to address community speed concerns and advise the Committee of Cabinet's decision to adopt a formal position on the establishment of a CSEI.

Policy Framework and Previous Decisions

2. In February 2017 the County Council's Cabinet considered a report on the Council's proposed approach to community speed cameras and inter alia agreed to write to the Department for Transport (DfT) on the matter and to campaign for a change to national policy guidance. In the meantime, the Director of Environment and Transport was authorised to develop trial schemes and local criteria for a local safety camera scheme.
3. On 10 March 2017, the Cabinet resolved to fund a Community Speed Enforcement initiative (average speed camera) at seven trial sites throughout Leicestershire, using average speed cameras at a cost (from 2016/17 underspends) of £500,000.
4. In approving the trial consideration was given to:
 - i. 'Road Casualty Reduction in Leicestershire and Future Approach to Casualty Reduction' report, which was considered by the Environment and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 12 September 2016.
 - ii. The Government's policy for safety cameras (Department for Transport, Handbook of Rules and Guidance for the National Safety Camera Programme for England and Wales for 2006/07).
 - iii. The Government's guidance on the use of speed and red light cameras for traffic enforcement: guidance on deployment, visibility and signing (DfT Circular 01/2007).
5. On 20 October 2020 the Cabinet adopted a formal position on the establishment of a Community Speed Enforcement Initiative, following the trial of average speed cameras at seven locations in Leicestershire.

Background

6. Communities often contact the Council to report concerns over speeding of vehicles and safety for local people. Previously, the Council's approach, in line with many other authorities was to adopt a strict interpretation of national guidance (DfT Circular 01/2007) that would only allow enforcement cameras to be installed at sites with a serious accident record and where speeds commonly significantly exceeded the speed limit. As a result, the Council has often been unable to offer assistance in the form of enforcement cameras to communities expressing concerns about speeding and safety.
7. In acknowledgment of the considerable community concern Cabinet considered a report in February 2017 setting out the relevant issues including the Authority's position that community concerns could be better met if revenue generated from fines could be retained locally rather than at central government level.
8. The Cabinet resolved to write to the DfT on the matter and, if necessary, to continue to campaign for a change to national policy guidance on safety cameras seeking new criteria for identifying suitable locations for installation of safety cameras and agreement to the proposal that local authorities retain fine income to fund camera installation costs.
9. The Cabinet agreed to seek support from the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership (LLRRSP) and in the meantime authorised the Director of Environment and Transport to develop trial schemes and local criteria for the use of safety cameras.
10. Building on this, and following dialogue with the DfT on 10 March 2017, the Cabinet resolved to fund a CSEI at seven trial sites throughout Leicestershire, on the basis of a wider interpretation of the guidance. The approach used average speed cameras at a cost of £500,000.
11. This new approach was to introduce average speed cameras in locations where speed data showed that the level of speeds in communities were excessive and where significant local concern had been expressed about speeding traffic. This would allow the Police to use average speed cameras to enforce speed limits at the Council's request, irrespective of the casualty record at the locations.

Role of the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership

12. The existing Safety Camera Scheme is directly managed by Leicestershire Police. It forms an integral part of the LLRRSP, which consists of the following organisations
 - Leicestershire County Council
 - Leicester City Council
 - Rutland Council
 - Leicestershire Police
 - Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service
 - Highways England
 - Leicestershire Magistrates' Courts
 - Public Health.

13. The LLRRSP has a history of excellent partnership working to deliver initiatives to support the safety of all road users. Positive engagement leading to strong relationships with communities and are an important part of all the member organisations' objectives.
14. The LLRRSP agreed to undertake enforcement activities to support the schemes on a trial basis. As a member of the partnership Leicestershire Police raised the issue that this would require enforcement of sites that do not meet the usual criteria for installation of cameras and may cause potential conflict in terms of use of resources. It was agreed that this would be monitored by the LLRRSP Board and consideration of the issue would be included in the trial evaluation.

Site Development

15. Seven sites were chosen for the trial, one in every district of the County. The sites were chosen to represent three different types of location:
- 1) Village sites (where a speeding problem exists, and the community has expressed concerns).
 - 2) Rural route sites (where there is a higher than national average accident rate and where a reduced speed limit and effective enforcement will reduce the rate).
 - 3) Key arterial route sites (to develop a corridor approach to enforce the speed limit and to provide such information as average speeds and journey times).
16. The table below indicates the proposed trial sites and the rationale for their choice:

Site	Category	Rationale
Sharnford (Blaby)	Village	A rural village with a longstanding community concerns, an LLRRSP site with mean speeds downhill of 31.2mph and 85 percentile speeds downhill of 35.9 mph in a 30mph limit.
Woodhouse Eaves (Charnwood)	Village	A rural village with a longstanding issue and community concerns, with mean speeds of 32.9 mph and 85 percentile speeds of 41.4 mph in a 30mph limit.
Measham (North West Leicestershire)	Village	A rural village with a long-standing issue and community concerns, an LLRRSP community concern site and a community speed watch site with mean speeds of 42.8 mph and 85 percentile speeds of 50 mph in the 30mph limit.
Walcote (Harborough)	Village	A rural village with a long-standing issue and community concerns, an LLRRSP community concern site with mean speeds of 35.4 mph and 85percentile speeds of 39 mph in a 30 mph limit.
B676 Melton to County boundary (Melton)	Rural Route	A low standard rural route with an accident rate of between 357 and 390 accidents per billion vehicle kilometres compared to a

		national average accident rate for rural roads of 267 accidents per billion vehicle kilometres. Proposals for a reduction in speed limit from National Speed Limit to 50mph currently being considered.
A6 Harborough Road, Oadby (Oadby and Wigston)	Major Arterial Route	A key arterial route providing access into the Principal Urban Area (PUA) and forming part of the Council's Major Route Network. Carries in excess of 19,500 vehicles per day with over 800 vehicles per day exceeding 50mph in a 30mph limit.
A50 Field Head to City boundary (Hinckley and Bosworth)	Major Arterial Route	A key arterial route providing access into the PUA and forming part of the Council's Major Route Network. Carries in excess of 25000 vehicles per day. Speed limit due to be reduced in April 2017 and requests for average speed cameras received during consultation.

17. Following approval from Cabinet, officers met with parishes and local representatives of the seven trial sites to explain the basis of the trial and agree the details for installation.
18. A detailed tender and procurement process was undertaken and Jenoptik Traffic Solutions UK (Jenoptik) was appointed to supply the equipment for the trial.
19. Once the site extents had been agreed a significant amount of preparatory work was required. This was undertaken by the County Council in conjunction with Jenoptik and included detailed site design, signing requirements and electrical and structural testing of the street furniture to be used to attach the camera.
20. Equipment calibration also had to be undertaken before the sites could become operational. It was also necessary to co-ordinate with the Leicestershire Police to ensure adequate enforcement capability was available.
21. As this was the first time the County Council had undertaken such a scheme, an estimated programme was developed taking into account the activities set out above. The extensive amount of preparatory work for each aspect of the trial took longer than expected resulting in a delay to the start dates, which were as follows:
 - 15 September 2018 - Sharnford, Measham and Walcote
 - 2 November 2018 - Groby and Oadby
 - 10 January 2019 - Woodhouse Eaves
 - August/September 2019 - B676 Freeby (delayed due to complex power issues).

Data from the Trial - Traffic speeds

22. In order to establish a base data set, and support analysis of the trial, 'before' surveys were carried out at all locations during May 2017. The data collection exercise was extended to additional roads where communities had also raised concerns.

23. This data was then used to establish the locations for the average speed cameras in consultation with the local parish and district council.
24. Further data on traffic speeds has been collected at regular intervals during the trial at all sites that are operational to judge the effect on speeds of having the cameras in place. Speed data was collected when the signs were installed, when the cameras were installed, and at various times during the operational period of the sites. A summary of the speed data by location is detailed in the table below.

<u>Location</u>	<u>Speed Limit</u>	<u>Direction</u>	<u>Average Daily Total 2019 (ADT)</u>	<u>Before</u>		<u>During</u>		<u>After</u>	
				<u>85th %ile</u>	<u>Mean Speed</u>	<u>85th %ile</u>	<u>Mean Speed</u>	<u>85th %ile</u>	<u>Mean Speed</u>
Sharnford, opposite The Bricklayers PH	30	Northeastbound	4362	30.2	27.2	28.5	25.4	28.7	25.8
		Southwestbound	4004	29.4	25.9	29.1	25.3	27.7	24.3
		Combined		29.9	26.6	28.8	25.4	28.3	25.1
Beacon Road, Woodhouse Eaves	40	Eastbound	3566	41	35.7	35.7	29.2	36.9	29.7
		Westbound	3354	38.1	32.3	35	27.3	34.4	26.9
		Combined		39.9	34	35.5	28.3	36	28.4
Burton Road, Measham	30	Southeastbound	1647	45.8	38.3	43.2	35.9	30.9	28.2
		Northwestbound	1506	45.5	38.6	43.4	36.7	31.1	28.1
		Combined		45.5	38.4	43.4	36.3	31	28.1
A4304 Lutterworth Road, Walcote	30	Eastbound	5138	32.2	27.9	32.2	28	29.1	26
		Westbound	5135	34	28.8	33.1	28	29.5	25.8
		Combined		33.1	28.4	32.7	28	29.3	25.9
B676 Saxby Road, Freeby	50	Eastbound	2256	59.8	52.9	49.7	43.7	50.9	46.5
		Westbound	2331	57.5	51	49.2	42.2	52	47.3
		Combined		58.7	52	49.4	43	51.4	46.9
A6, Oadby	40	Northwestbound	11343	38.8	29.6	36.1	26.8	33.5	24.7
		Southeastbound	11733	41.6	35.7	40.9	34.9	37.8	32.9
		Combined		40.2	32.7	38.5	30.9	35.7	28.8
A50 Bradgate Hill, Groby	40	Northwestbound	13812	52.3	44.6	53.3	45.4	44	39.5
		Southeastbound	14487	52.6	45.1	53.2	45.6	43.6	39.3
		Combined		52.4	44.9	53.3	45.5	43.8	39.4

Enforcement activity

25. In Leicestershire enforcement activity is managed by Leicestershire Police in line with the memorandum of understanding that underpins the LLRRSP. A key principle of the memorandum is that the Police have ultimate operational control of enforcement resource.
26. Enforcement activity at all seven sites in the trial has been on a 'dynamic enforcement' basis, i.e. whilst the cameras are continuously 'switched on' enforcement activity was limited to a few sites at any one time. This is national common practice and is based on the ability of the Police to enforce. All seven sites operated on an equal basis for the duration of the trial.

27. Enforcement of the speed limit at each of the trial sites resulted in a number of penalty notices being issued and also offers of Driver Education Workshops places being made. These aspects have been monitored on a regular basis throughout the operation of the trial.
28. Offences are categorised into three distinct classifications, those where the drivers are offered a Driver Education Work Course, those where they receive a Fixed Penalty Notice, and those where the driver is summoned to attend court. The speed threshold is as detailed in the table below:

Limit	Device tolerance	Fixed Penalty when education is not appropriate	Speed Awareness if appropriate		Summons in all other cases and above
			From	To	
20 mph	22 mph	24 mph	24 mph	31 mph	35 mph
30 mph	32 mph	35 mph	35 mph	42 mph	50 mph
40 mph	42 mph	46 mph	46 mph	53 mph	66 mph
50 mph	52 mph	57 mph	57 mph	64 mph	76 mph
60 mph	62 mph	68 mph	68 mph	75 mph	86 mph
70 mph	73 mph	79 mph	79 mph	86 mph	96 mph

All speeds identified above are those shown on the speed device, speedometer or other detection devices

29. Since the cameras have been operational just over 17 million vehicles have passed sites in Sharnford, Walcote, Measham, Oadby, Woodhouse Eaves and Groby, with 0.09% of those vehicle owners - 15,300 - issued with notices.
30. A summary of the total offences by site since the cameras went live is detailed by site, by direction in the table below.

Site Per Direction	Type of Offence			All Offences
	Speed Awareness	Conditional Offer	Court	
B4114 Sharnford NE	270	3	0	273
B4114 Sharnford NW	42	0	0	42
Woodhouse East	154	6	1	161
Woodhouse West	74	2	0	76
Measham East	3151	434	40	3625
Measham West	4217	679	79	4975
Walcote East	2371	127	7	2505
Walcote West	2840	155	12	3007
B676 East	47	2	0	49
B676 West	78	0	0	78
A6 North	45	3	0	48
A6 South	241	27	1	269
A50 North	2895	183	1	3079
A50 South	1566	65	5	1636

31. Whilst all offences are processed by Leicestershire Police not all Driver Education Workshop (DEW) Courses are completed in Leicestershire. This is because offenders may only have been travelling through Leicestershire and want to take a course closer to work or home for instance. As a result, not all income from DEW will be received in Leicestershire. Therefore, there can be no straight-line correlation on income received through the DEW.
32. It should be noted that from the time of the offence to completing a course is estimated at 12 weeks.
33. The table below details the current percentage of those offenders completing courses within Leicestershire and those going elsewhere to complete a Driver Education Workshop:

	Leicestershire	Other	Total
B4114 SHARNFORD NORTHEASTBOUND	47.8	52.2	100
B4114 SHARNFORD SOUTHWESTBOUND	43.5	56.5	100
BEACON ROAD, WOODHOUSE EAVES NORTHEASTBOUND	81.8	18.2	100
BEACON ROAD, WOODHOUSE EAVES SOUTHWESTBOUND	94.4	5.6	100
BURTON ROAD, MEASHAM EASTBOUND	42.5	57.5	100
BURTON ROAD, MEASHAM WESTBOUND	48.6	51.4	100
A4304 LUTTERWORTH ROAD, WALCOTE EASTBOUND	46.4	53.6	100
A4304 LUTTERWORTH ROAD, WALCOTE WESTBOUND	44.8	55.2	100
A6 OADBY NORTHBOUND	90	10	100
A6 OADBY SOUTHBOUND	78.3	21.7	100
A50 BRADGATE HILL, GROBY NORTHWESTBOUND	74.5	25.5	100
A50 BRADGATE HILL, GROBY SOUTHEASTBOUND	58.3	41.7	100
Total	52.2	47.8	100

Air Quality and Noise Pollution

34. Data on air and noise pollution have been collected at regular intervals during the trial. This has been used to help identify any impact the installation of average speed cameras can have in managing air and noise pollution for communities.
35. Road vehicles are the main source of air pollution in the most populated urban environments, with pollutants that have the greatest health impacts. The government has identified that the most immediate and urgent air quality challenge faced by local authorities is to tackle the problem of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) concentrations around roads, as road transport is responsible for approximately 80% of roadside NO₂ concentrations.
36. In July 2017, Defra and the DfT's Joint Air Quality Unit (JAQU) published its plan for tackling air quality: *Air Quality Plan for tackling roadside nitrogen dioxide (NO₂)*. The Plan set out actions to bring NO₂ air pollution within statutory limits in the shortest possible time.
37. Whilst none of the average speed camera sites are considered to have an air quality issue in line with national guidance the data does show that the 'smoothing

out' (travelling at more consistent speed) of traffic speeds does have a positive effect on NO₂ levels, as shown in this table:

Location	Before	Signs Installed	During
	µg NO ₂	µg NO ₂	µg NO ₂
B4114, Sharnford	0.48	0.58	0.38
Beacon Road, Woodhouse Eaves	0.4	0.36	0.24
Burton Road, Measham	0.55	0.39	0.34
A4304 Lutterworth Road, Walcote	0.46	0.53	0.23
B676 Saxby Road, Freeby	0.34	0.27	N/A
A6, Oadby	0.52	0.68	0.33
A50 Bradgate Hill, Groby	0.51	0.56	0.34

38. None of the average speed camera sites are considered to have noise issue and the data indicates a minimal change in noise data in some communities but this is not significant, as shown in the table below:

Location	Before	After
	LAEQ,16hr	LAEQ,16hr
B4114, Sharnford	72.2	77.2
Beacon Road, Woodhouse Eaves	72.9	71.3
Burton Road, Measham	69.8	64.6
A4304 Lutterworth Road, Walcote	74.5	78.3
B676 Saxby Road, Freeby	74.6	74.0
A6, Oadby	70.7	71.6
A50 Bradgate Hill, Groby	75.8	74.3

Police Community Concern Sites

39. In June 2019 the Police introduced 'community concern sites' as a category of site that does not have an accident record. These sites traditionally would not meet the criteria for Core Mobile or Static speed enforcement by the Safety Camera Team within Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.
40. Broadly a Police community concern site is a site where 50% of all speeds are over the National Police and Crime Commissioner (NPCC) threshold. Sites identified as a 'community concern site' can be visited at least once every six weeks as detailed in the Police's Enforcement Strategy for mobile speed enforcement under the community concern category.

Proposals

41. The results of the CSEI trial show that average speed cameras have had a positive impact in reducing vehicle speed. The decision by Cabinet will facilitate the introduction of a new CSEI that incorporates the experience gained through the trial and will provide an appropriate framework to identify and deliver new sites using a consistent and evidenced based approach.

42. Speeding offences are enforced by the Police. The LLRRSP manages speed camera programme with enforcement being undertaken by Leicestershire Police in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland and a successful role out of community average speed camera enforcement initiatives is therefore dependent on the partnership
43. Based on the experience of the trial, DfT guidance and liaison with the LLRRSP, the County Council proposes to introduce a programme of community speed enforcement to deliver appropriate measures to reduce speed in communities as set out below.
44. Before being considered as a suitable location for installation of average speed cameras, the following criteria must be satisfied:
 - i. Communities must have a speeding issue which meets the new police community concern site criteria of 50% of all traffic above the NPCC threshold. (There may already be an identified accident issue.)
 - ii. The location will be reviewed by the County Council and the Police to establish if the speed limit is appropriate in line with DfT guidance, with the understanding that some speed limits may change, rather than enforcement initiatives being installed.
 - iii. Communities, in liaison with the County Council, must explore and exhaust all other appropriate options for reducing speed (such as Gateway treatments, Community Speed Watch, Vehicle Activated Signs, mobile Vehicle Activated Signs) before installation of speed cameras is considered.
 - iv. Local Community representatives are in agreement.
 - v. It must be possible to install the necessary cameras and equipment on site at a reasonable and proportionate cost to the County Council.
 - vi. It can be demonstrated that there are no other options for managing speed within the community. (The general principle is that speed cameras should be a last resort solution, not the first.)
45. It should be noted that the proposed criteria mean cameras will not be installed in communities with a perceived speed problem i.e. data confirms that less than 50% of traffic exceeds the NPCC threshold. The above criteria will ensure:
 - i. an evidence based consistent approach
 - ii. proactive engagement by communities who have tried to resolve the issue by participating in schemes to help change driver behaviour
 - iii. all other traffic management techniques have been explored/implemented
 - iv. the speed limit is appropriate for the environment
 - v. consistency across responsible organisations
 - vi. that officers can manage resources appropriately within the initiative.
46. Officers will arrange to update the identified list of potential sites using new data, subject to the criteria above, in the New Year. The first 12 months of the programme will be focussed on identifying alternative options to managing speed and working through the criteria to ascertain which sites suitable for alternative

interventions and those suitable for average speed cameras. These elements will form the programme for the scheme ongoing.

47. From this work, a rolling programme of sites will be identified, and average speed camera assets will be moved around the county in line with the updated programme. The programme will be developed in Spring 2021 as data is collated and the criteria are worked through for potential sites. This process will be repeated annually to include any new sites put forward for consideration.
48. Operational enforcement will continue to be managed by the police through the LLRRSP facilitated by the Memorandum of Understanding.

Government lobbying

49. The County Council has made a number of direct approaches to HM Treasury to seek a change to the national policy on the funding of camera sites. Currently, any fine income is passed to the Treasury. The Council has asked that money from fines can first be used to fund the cost of the community safety initiatives, including the costs of average speed cameras, with any remaining funding reverting to HM Treasury.
50. Whilst the Government appreciates the possible benefits of the proposal, HM Treasury has advised that it does not support the retention of fine income by local authorities. The County Council will continue to make the case for a change, which would enable it to extend the scheme to other communities across Leicestershire.

Consultation

51. It is intended that consultation with local communities on the proposed locations for the cameras will take place from Spring 2021 onwards.

Resource Implications

52. The staff costs of £50,000 per annum have been informed by the trial. Maintaining all 14 sites is expected to cost £110,000. To ensure all communities within the criteria can benefit sites will need to be relocated. This will cost £245,000 based on an estimated cost of £35,000 per site and assuming seven sites will be moved yearly. A summary of the resource requirements against the current funding available is provided below:

	One-off £m	On-going £m
Staffing		0.05
Camera maintenance cost across 14 sites		0.11
Site relocation (moving 7 sites annually)		0.25
Site installation (7 sites)	0.42	
Total Cost	0.42	0.41
Current Budget	-0.60	-0.06
Revenue Funding Requirement	-0.18	0.35

53. Whilst there is a revenue budget of £55,000 to fund ongoing maintenance of the existing seven sites, the ongoing revenue budget for additional sites will need to be managed as part of the existing maintenance programme in future years.
54. In addition to revenue, Capital investment will be required to implement each new site where average speed cameras are installed. It is proposed that the number of sites that could be installed per year will be limited to ensure there is adequate resource to carry out full consultation and scheme development when identified.
55. A Capital allocation of £600,000 has been assigned from the additional £7.3million Highways budget in 2020/21.
56. In those instances where communities do not have any traffic management solutions already in place, all reasonable measures will be considered before cameras are installed. At present funding for these measures will be managed from the highways and transport capital programme.
57. Funding of the programme will be identified and managed through the annual Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme.
58. The Director of Corporate Resources and the Director of Law and Governance were consulted on the content of the Cabinet report.

Timetable for Decisions

59. Cabinet approved the CSEI at its meeting on 20 October 2020.
60. County Council in consultation with the LLRRSP will immediately begin to update the relevant data and identify potential sites, assess them fully against the proposed implementation criteria and then procure equipment and make arrangements for enforcement as required.
61. Any comments received from the Environment and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be considered by the Director of Environment and Transport to help in the delivery of the initiatives.

Conclusion

62. In March 2017 Cabinet resolved to fund a CSEI at seven trial sites throughout Leicestershire, introducing average speed cameras at locations where speed data showed that the level of speeds in communities were excessive and where significant local concern had been expressed about speeding traffic. The sites (one in each district) were chosen to represent three different types of location – village sites, rural route sites and key arterial route sites. The results of the trial show that average speed cameras have had a positive impact in reducing vehicle speed.
63. On 20 October 2020 the Cabinet adopted a formal position on the establishment of a CSEI. Officers will arrange to update an identified list of potential sites in the New Year. The first 12 months of the programme will be focussed on identifying alternative options to managing speed ascertaining which sites are suitable for alternative interventions and those suitable for average speed cameras.

64. From this work, a rolling programme of sites will be identified, and average speed camera assets will be moved around the county in line with the updated programme. The programme will be developed in Spring 2021 and the process repeated annually to include any new sites put forward for consideration. It is intended that consultation with local communities on the proposed locations for the cameras will take place from Spring 2021 onwards.
65. Funding of the programme will be identified and managed through the annual Highways and Transportation Capital Programme and Works Programme. A Capital allocation of £600,000 has been assigned from the additional £7.3m Highways budget in 2020/21.
66. Any comments received from the Scrutiny Committee will be considered by the Director of Environment and Transport to help in the delivery of the initiatives.

Background Papers

Cabinet – 20 October 2020 – Community Speed Enforcement Initiative

<http://politics.leics.gov.uk/documents/s157173/Community%20Speed%20Enforcement%20Initiative.pdf>

Environment and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee - 12 September 2016 – ‘Road Casualty Reduction in Leicestershire and Future Approach to Casualty Reduction’

<http://politics.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=1044&MIId=4781&Ver=4>

Community Speed Enforcement: Cabinet Report 10 February 2017

<http://politics.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MIId=4858>

Community Speed Enforcement: Cabinet Report 10 March 2017

<http://politics.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MIId=4859>

Circulation under the Local Issues Alert Procedure

The Cabinet report, on which this Scrutiny report is based, was circulated to all Members of the County Council.

Officer to Contact

Ann Carruthers – Director

Environment and Transport

Tel: (0116) 305 7000

Email: ann.carruthers@leics.gov.uk

Ian Vears – Assistant Director

Environment and Transport

Tel: (0116) 305 7966

Email: ian.vears@leics.gov.uk

Relevant Impact Assessments

Equality and Human Rights Implications

67. There are no Equality and Human Rights Implications directly arising from this report. The proposed policy changes would bring a significant benefit to communities with speeding concerns
68. The ability to install speed cameras more freely will reduce road deaths and injuries and improve the quality of life for the communities served by the County Council.
69. No detailed equality assessment has been undertaken on the proposed changes to community speed enforcement. Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessments (EHRIs) will be undertaken, as appropriate, during the review of any appropriate departmental strategies, prior to final decisions being made.

Crime and Disorder Implications

70. The Council continues to recognise the importance of seeking to address crime and fear of crime, including from speeding vehicles. It emphasises the importance of implementing policies and measures to support safe, high quality environments

Environmental Implications

71. Data has shown a positive effect on Air Quality throughout the trial.

Partnership Working and Associated Issues

72. The existing Safety Camera Scheme is directly managed by Leicestershire Police. It forms an integral part of the LLRRSP, which consists of the following organisations
 - Leicestershire County Council
 - Leicester City Council
 - Rutland Council
 - Leicestershire Police
 - Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service
 - Highways England
 - Leicestershire Magistrates' Courts
 - Public Health.
73. The LLRRSP has a history of excellent partnership working to deliver initiatives to support the safety of all road users. Positive engagement leading to strong relationships with communities and are an important part of all the member organisations' objectives.
74. Speeding offences are enforced by the Police. The LLRRSP manages speed camera programme with enforcement being undertaken by Leicestershire Police in Leicester,

Leicestershire and Rutland and a successful role out of community average speed camera enforcement initiatives is therefore dependent on the partnership.

75. The LLRRSP agreed to undertake enforcement activities to support the schemes on a trial basis. As a member of the partnership Leicestershire Police raised the issue that this would require enforcement of sites that do not meet the usual criteria for installation of cameras and may cause potential conflict in terms of use of resources. It was agreed that this would be monitored by the LLRRSP Board and consideration of the issue would be included in the trial evaluation.