

# Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Report of Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

To

Traffic and Parking Working Party and Cabinet  
Committee

On

14 September 2017

Agenda  
Item No

Report prepared by Peter Geraghty  
Director of Planning & Transport

---

Deployment of Fixed Safety Cameras  
Executive Councillor: Councillor Tony Cox

A Part 1 Public Agenda Item

---

## 1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To seek Members, views on the approach to the deployment of safety cameras in the Borough.

## 2. Recommendation

**That Members consider the report and decide whether to install a fixed safety camera.**

## 3. Background

- 3.1 A request has been made for a safety camera on the west bound carriageway of Eastern Avenue (A1159) close to the roundabout at Sutton Road (outside No. 38 Eastern Avenue). This request was made by Ward Councillors Van Looy and Ayling on behalf of a local resident who claimed there was anti-social behaviour from drivers.
- 3.2 Officers investigated the matter and found that the proposed location did not meet the criteria set out by the Safer Essex Roads Partnership (of which Southend is a member). The criteria are as follows:
- Site length: Between 400m and 1500m – This is the length of road that can be used for criteria 2 & 3 below.
  - Collisions: A collision severity score is calculated by the formula = 5 x [number of fatal or serious collisions] + [number of slight-injury collisions]. The score for the 36 month baseline period must be 20 points or more per kilometre for built up areas. None built up 16 points per kilometre.
  - Traffic speed: Speed survey data showing that the free-flow 85th percentile speed is at or above the enforcement threshold in built-up areas, or 5mph over the maximum speed limit in non-built up areas (35mph). In other words, at least 15% of vehicles at the site are going fast enough above the speed limit to be prosecuted for a speeding offence.

- 3.3 The police did not support the installation of a permanent camera as it did not meet the criteria. Mobile speed cameras were deployed in July 2016 by the Police for several months. They also installed with the support of the Council fixed ANPR cameras in Eastern Avenue. The ANPR cameras were installed to enable the Police to record footage of vehicles to support where best to deploy the mobile speed cameras. These cameras build a picture of driver behaviour; for example, a vehicle that is having multiple hits during a short period of time is probably demonstrating anti-social or illegal behaviour. The system allows the Police to check the registration details against a database which also checks insurance MOT and Car Tax. They are in addition to mobile speed enforcement.
- 3.4 Officers advised the Ward Members that the suggested location outside No 38 Easter Avenue did not meet the criteria. Following a meeting on site officers suggested an alternative solution by installing rumble strips to influence driver behaviour and reduce speed. This was rejected by the ward Members.
- 3.5 A safety audit was then carried out of alternative locations and one at Bournemouth Park Road was assessed. Whilst this met two of the criteria by staggering the speed check markings which of itself is unusual (see details of the audit attached). This location still does not meet the speed criteria for intervention.
- 3.6 Whilst the Safer Essex Roads Partnership would progress with an order to install the camera it would be at the expense of the Council. The estimated cost of installing the camera would be almost £28,000. There is no budget for installing safety cameras.
- 3.7 This throws up a number of issues on which Traffic and Parking Working Party views are invited. These are set out below;
- 3.8 Firstly, there is no identified budget for installing safety cameras (outside the Safety Partnership) and if this proposal proceeds it will have to be funded from existing budgets such as the Members' requests budget. Members may recall that one of the benefits in joining the safety partnership was that it allowed the reduction in budgets for this area of work and delivered substantial savings to the Council. The running and maintenance costs for cameras are borne by the partnership.
- 3.9 Secondly, if the Council agree to install a safety camera in a location that does not meet the criteria of the Safer Essex Roads Partnership (of which it is a member) it may lead to further requests from Members and the public for cameras in locations that similarly do not meet the criteria and may not be supported by the Partnership. In such cases, the Council will be under pressure to follow precedents set which will lead to inconsistent decision-making and a financial pressure where budgets have previously been reduced.
- 3.10 Finally, the Council has no policy of its own in respect of safety cameras and has up to now followed the guidance of the Safer Essex Roads Partnership. This proposal is not supported by the police.

#### **4. Legal Requirements**

The Council has general duties under the Highways Act 1980 and the camera needs to meet the requirements of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

#### **5. Other Options**

Not to proceed with a safety camera installation.

#### **6. Reason for Recommendation**

To seek views on the Council's approach to installing safety cameras and the impact this would have on the Council's budget.

#### **7. Corporate Implications**

The relevant aims of the Council's vision include:

- Clean, ensuring a well maintained and attractive street scene, parks and open spaces
- Safe, ensure that works are carried out safely and are safe for highway users.

##### **7.1 Financial Implications**

The proposed new safety camera will have to be funded by the Council as it does not meet the necessary installation criteria. There will be implications in respect of the additional impact on staff and resources arising from helping with the design and installation of the camera.

##### **7.2 Legal Implications**

The Council has general duties under the Highways Act 1980 and the camera needs to meet the requirements of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

##### **7.3. People Implications**

There will be additional impact on staff and resources arising from helping with the design and installation of the camera.

##### **7.4 Property Implications**

Not relevant to this particular matter

##### **7.5 Consultation**

Not relevant to this particular matter.

##### **7.6 Equalities and Diversity Implications**

None relevant to this particular matter.

## **7.7 Risk Assessment**

This issue is dealt with in the main body of the report.

## **7.8 Value for Money**

The proposed new safety camera will have to be funded by the Council as it does not meet the necessary installation criteria.

## **7.9 Community Safety Implications**

This is dealt with in the main body of the report.

## **7.10 Environmental Impact**

The camera will be noticeable in the street scene and will require trees to be pruned back.

## **8. Background Papers**

Safer Essex Roads Partnership Guidance for safety cameras

Southend Design & Townscape Guide

Southend Streetscape Manual

Highways Act 1980

The Road Traffic Act 1988

## **9. Appendices**

**Appendix 1 - Safety Audit for Eastern Avenue**