



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Cabinet Highways Report

9

Report of: Executive Director, Place

Date: 12th January 2012

Subject: Camera Enforcement Using Mobile and Relocatable Cameras

Author of Report: Kevan Butt 0114 273 5886

Summary:

This report proposes the introduction of parking enforcement using vehicles equipped with cameras for certain types of contravention. It also recommends introducing a more effective form of camera enforcement at existing bus and tram gates and bus lanes.

Reasons for Recommendations:

Mobile camera enforcement is proposed in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of parking enforcement at key locations such as schools, arterial routes, bus stop clearways and other locations where traditional methods of enforcement have proved ineffective. The introduction of new, re-locatable bus lane cameras is proposed to allow more flexibility and greater efficiency of bus lane enforcement at locations where camera enforcement does not currently take place.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that approval is given to the introduction of camera enforcement of certain parking contraventions (as detailed in the report). It is also recommended that a fully automated (rather than observed) mobile camera enforcement system is implemented when new enforcement is introduced at some existing bus and tram gates and bus lanes.

Background Papers:

Category of Report: OPEN

Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

Financial Implications
YES Cleared by: Catherine Rodgers
Legal Implications
YES Cleared by: Julian Ward
Equality of Opportunity Implications
YES Cleared by: Ian Oldershaw
Tackling Health Inequalities Implications
NO
Human rights Implications
NO:
Environmental and Sustainability implications
YES
Economic impact
YES
Community safety implications
YES
Human resources implications
NO
Property implications
NO
Area(s) affected All areas across the city
Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Cllr Leigh Bramall
Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in Economic Environment and Well-being
Is the item a matter which is reserved for approval by the City Council? YES/NO
Press release
YES

PARKING AND BUS LANE ENFORCEMENT USING MOBILE CAMERAS

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report proposes the introduction of enforcement of some parking contraventions at specific locations using approved camera enforcement equipment mounted on Council vehicles.
- 1.2 It also proposes introducing a more cost effective way of implementing camera enforcement at existing bus and tram gates and bus lanes by using cameras that can be relocated.

2.0 WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR SHEFFIELD PEOPLE

- 2.1 Enforcement of parking contraventions using mobile cameras will enhance the effectiveness of enforcement in the specific areas detailed in the report. More effective enforcement will improve safety around schools, make bus stops more accessible, both for their drivers and for passengers and it will also reduce traffic congestion at key locations at busy times of the day.
- 2.2 The introduction of re-locatable enforcement cameras at existing bus and tram gates and bus lanes will enable more sites to be enforced at a lower overall cost. More effective enforcement at bus and tram gates and bus lanes will contribute to improving public transport reliability.

3.0 OUTCOME AND SUSTAINABILITY

- 3.1 Mobile camera enforcement should discourage drivers from parking illegally at locations which are dangerous and which cause traffic congestion. By reducing traffic congestion local air quality will improve and less CO₂ will be emitted. Improved compliance with parking restrictions along main arterial routes (which are also bus corridors) should help to improve the reliability of local bus services, which will make them more attractive.
- 3.2 Ongoing enforcement using camera equipped vehicles should provide a deterrent to drivers from parking illegally.
- 3.3 Increasing camera enforcement at bus lanes and bus gates should contribute to more reliable public transport journey times and journey time reliability.

4.0 REPORT

- 4.1 Since the implementation of part 6 of the Traffic Management Act on 31 March 2008, local authorities which have responsibility for Civil Parking Enforcement have had powers to use camera equipment (approved devices) to enforce some parking

restrictions.

- 4.2 Most parking contraventions can be enforced relatively successfully using traditional foot patrols, with Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) being issued by being placed on the vehicle windscreen or handed to the driver. However, there are certain contraventions which are difficult to enforce successfully due to the fact that drivers frequently park illegally for short periods of time and PCNs are difficult to issue using traditional methods as the vehicles are driven away before the PCN can be legally served to the vehicle or to the driver.
- 4.3 Although, the vehicles may park for relatively short periods of time, they nevertheless cause significant danger or traffic congestion due to the nature of the location. In some cases drivers will park illegally, stay in the vehicle until approached by a Civil Enforcement Officer and will then drive off before a PCN can be issued. As a result, there is no deterrent to illegal parking because drivers are aware that the likelihood of a PCN being successfully issued is extremely remote.
- 4.4 The relevant contraventions and locations affected by illegal parking which is difficult to enforce using foot patrols are as follows:-
- Keep Clear and no waiting restrictions around schools
 - No waiting / No loading restrictions along arterial routes
 - Bus Stop clearways
 - No Waiting restrictions at locations near some shops, such as take-away and fast food shops
 - Illegal ranking by taxis
- 4.5 Illegal parking at all of the above locations can cause danger, traffic congestion and/or significant inconvenience for other road users, residents and businesses. The introduction of enforcement using camera equipped vehicles will enable the Council to use the evidence to issue a postal PCN to the registered keeper of the vehicle. This should make drivers re-consider parking illegally, as they will no longer be able to escape receiving a PCN by driving away from the location where their vehicle has been illegally parked.
- 4.6 In order to enable more effective enforcement at the above locations, it is proposed to introduce vehicles equipped with camera approved devices. It will also be necessary to install warning signs so that motorists are aware of the fact that cameras are being used. Based on the experience of other towns and cities which have successfully introduced this method of enforcement, such as Nottingham and Bournemouth, signs will be required on the city boundaries and smaller repeater signs will be

required in the specific areas at intervals of around one kilometre according to Department of Transport Guidance.

- 4.7 The Bus Lane Contraventions (Penalty Charges, Adjudication and Enforcement) (England) Regulations 2005 gave Councils outside London the power to enforce bus and tram lanes (and gates) using approved cameras.
- 4.8 The start of using cameras to enforce bus lanes was approved by Cabinet on 24 May 2006. It was agreed that this should initially be at the Hillsborough and Glossop Road bus and tram gates and extended to other locations later. It also approved other arrangements including the individual cost of a Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) and the adjudication arrangements for disputed PCNs.
- 4.9 Following approval by Cabinet, the Council started 'observed' camera enforcement of the tram and bus gates at Hillsborough in July 2007. 'Observed' means that the offence is observed and recorded by a CCTV operator as it actually happens.
- 4.10 CCTV camera enforcement at Hillsborough led to the average inbound tram journey times between Hillsborough Park and Hillsborough Interchange in the morning peak period (0800-0900) more than halving. Since the Hillsborough scheme, camera enforcement started at the bus gate on the Wicker in November 2007 and more recently at Glossop Road bus and tram gate, Bridge Street bus gate and on the Queens Road and Granville Road bus lanes.
- 4.11 The 'observed' nature of the current enforcement system requires the transmission of good quality images in real time. This has meant that CCTV enforcement has been limited to sites that are near a fibre optic network, as the costs associated with extending a fibre optic network are high. This in turn has led to a limited expansion of CCTV enforcement, especially at sites where there is a low level of abuse, even though this abuse may cause significant public transport delays.
- 4.12 Since 2008, standards for the certification of equipment (through the Department for Transport) and the development of camera systems have led to the production of smaller equipment that can more easily be re-located between different bus lane sites for capturing contraventions. These cameras do not have to be watched to record offences, so they do not need to be near a fibre optic network. They simply record an offence as it happens and then stores the necessary evidence on an inbuilt computer hard drive. Recorded images are then transmitted (using a wireless or mobile phone network), to the Council as they would still need to be 'reviewed' by Council staff. These changes mean that it is now

viable to introduce camera enforcement at sites that were previously too costly.

- 4.13 Work is underway with bus and tram operators and the Passenger Transport Executive to prioritise future sites for camera enforcement based on where it will achieve the greatest benefits to bus / tram passengers. Sites already identified (in no particular priority) include Bolsover Street, Boston Street, Mansfield Road, Cumberland Street and Broad Street.

Relevant Implications

Financing mobile enforcement of parking restrictions

- 4.14 The cost of equipping one mobile enforcement vehicle and the associated I.T. systems to review the footage is anticipated to be in the region of £50,000 and there will be additional costs (around £46,000) to install the required warning signs and to renew some elements of the road markings and signs which denote the parking restrictions. There will also be Capita procurement and project management costs of around £28,000. It is anticipated that total expenditure of around £124,000 will be required to successfully introduce mobile CCTV enforcement. There are no additional ongoing costs of administering the system as it utilises existing staff resources. The initial set up costs will be funded from prudential borrowing and repaid over the two years 2012/13 and 2013/14.
- 4.15 It is anticipated that approximately 20 PCNs per day will be issued from the camera vehicle. The additional PCNs are expected to produce in the region of £160,000 per year, based on current recovery rates.

Financing flexible enforcement of bus and tram lanes and gates

- 4.16 The knock on effect of mobile camera enforcement means that only one CEO is required in the vehicle, rather than the current two CEOs per vehicle. This is because the equipment works in "automatic" mode and so only a driver is needed in the vehicle. On the basis that a camera vehicle will be able to cover two arterial routes, releasing three CEOs to be able to cover other areas where enforcement is not currently regularly carried out during the morning and evening peak periods (7.30 a.m. to 9.30 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 6.30 p.m.). Releasing CEOs will enable additional foot patrols which could lead to an additional income in the region of £24,000 per annum, based issuing 3 PCNs per day, at current recovery rates.
- 4.17 Based on a repayment period of 2 years, this would bring in net additional income of around £110,300 per full year to the Parking Services budget. From year 3 onwards, the net additional income could rise to around £177,000 per annum. However, this level of

income will likely reduce in the longer term as motorists become aware of the effectiveness of camera enforcement and illegal parking at key known hotspots diminishes. Additional income at bus and tram gates and lanes would be used to implement camera enforcement at more sites. The net financial implications are shown in Appendix A to this report.

- 4.18 The cost of purchasing a re-locatable bus lane camera system is anticipated to be in the region of £30,000 but there will be additional (site specific) costs to ensure that the required warning signs and road markings are up to standard. There will also be ongoing operational costs for moving the camera between different sites and for equipment maintenance. There are no additional ongoing costs of administering the system as it utilises existing staff resources. However, excluding any signing and lining changes, the cost of setting up a new camera site should be around £500 while the cost of moving a camera between sites should be around £200. Presuming one camera moving every two months between five sites, the cost would be around £2,500. The initial set up costs can be met from existing Bus Lane PCN income in 2011/12.
- 4.19 Depending on the site that the re-locatable camera equipment is employed, it is anticipated that around 15 PCNs per day will be issued from the unit. The additional PCNs could produce in the region of £80,000 per year.
- 4.20 Improved enforcement of parking and bus lane restrictions using cameras is expected to increase the number of PCNs issued which will cover the cost of setting up and operating the system. If the resultant income allows, it is proposed to purchase additional re-locatable cameras and to also equip a second mobile camera enforcement vehicle. This would allow camera enforcement on more tram and bus gates and bus lanes as well as parking on four of the current six arterial routes which are enforced each day between Monday and Friday - and other locations that are normally difficult to enforce, as and when required.
- 4.21 The Council already has powers to enforce parking restrictions and bus and tram gate and lane abuse using approved camera devices. There is an established appeals procedure for motorists to follow, if they consider that a PCN has been issued incorrectly or if there are unforeseen and compelling circumstances as to why a PCN should be cancelled. The procedure includes the opportunity to appeal to the independent Traffic Penalty Tribunal if the Council rejects representations from the motorist.
- 4.22 An Equality Impact Assessment has been conducted and concludes that the proposal is of universal positive benefit to all local people regardless of age, sex, race, faith, disability,

sexuality, etc. It should be of particular positive benefit to young people and families with children due to increased child safety (e.g. near schools) and to elderly and disabled people plus their carers due to increased accessibility (e.g. at bus stops).

- 4.23 Parking enforcement is carried out in a consistent manner in respect of all / any vehicles found to be parked in contravention of parking restrictions. Disabled Badge holders have exemptions from some restrictions and these will continue.

5.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 5.1 Traditional methods of parking enforcement have been used over the last six years, but the difficulties in areas around schools, bus routes and other areas mean that camera enforcement is necessary in order to change some drivers' habits of parking illegally.
- 5.2 The Police can enforce bus and tram gate and bus lane abuse, but there is often difficulty resourcing this role. Doing nothing is an option, as is continuing to use the existing 'observed' method of enforcement. However, this will limit the implementation of camera enforcement, which has already proven effective in helping to improve public transport reliability.

6.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The difficulties experienced in attempting to effectively enforce the types of parking contravention detailed in this report, mean that only the introduction of enforcement using camera equipped vehicles is likely to deter drivers from parking illegally. This consistent illegal parking creates dangerous conditions, congestion and often significant inconvenience for other road users, residents and local businesses.
- 6.2 The practical and financial difficulties experienced in expanding the existing camera enforcement system detailed in this report, mean that the introduction of mobile camera enforcement is an effective and efficient way of ensuring existing restrictions are adhered to at tram and bus gates and bus lanes..

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Introduce camera enforcement in Sheffield as detailed in this report and in respect of the restrictions specified.
- 7.2 Fund the associated implementation costs from prudential borrowing and repay over the following two years.

- 7.3 Implement a fully automated (rather than observed) re-locatable camera enforcement system when new enforcement starts at most existing bus and tram gates and bus lanes
- 7.4 Procure the camera equipment and associated I.T. Support Systems via Capita on behalf of the Council.

APPENDIX A

Mobile Camera Enforcement – Revenue Financial Implications Form

Revenue Financial Implications

The revenue expenditure implications of the proposals in this report may be summarised as follows:

	Year 1 (£000)	Year 2 (£000)	Full Year (£000)
(1) Additional Revenue Expenditure			
Employees			
Running costs	7	7	7
Operating Lease Rentals			
Capital Financing Costs			
Revenue Contribution to Capital Outlay	62	62	
Debt Charges on use of Credit Approvals	5	5	
Loss of interest on use of Capital Receipts			
Other (to be specified)			
	74	74	7

(2) Less Income from;

Fees & Charges	184	184	184
Grants / Subsidy			
Rent etc			
Savings (to be specified)			
	184	184	184

(3) Additional Net Revenue Expenditure

	-110	-110	-177
--	------	------	------

(4) Less Portfolio's [Year] Revenue Budget Provision

--	--	--	--

(5) Central Provision for debt charges / loss of interest

--	--	--	--

(6) Net Addition Cost / Saving (-)

	-110	-110	-177
--	------	------	------

Financial Implications Agreed By:	
Name: <u>Catherine Rodgers</u>	Date: <u>22/12/11</u>
Function within Finance Service: <u>Finance Manager</u>	