2,395 people have signed a petition objecting to the implementation and behaviour of the 2 CCTV vehicles and respectfully request a full review taking into account the following issues.

The vehicles have spent a disproportionate amount of time operating at the trivial end of the parking offence scale. The authorities have tried to justify their existence by continually stating that their presence has made schools safer but in short they have not been well received by the public at large.

The CCTV vehicles are a Conservative Administration initiative which will be a vote loser at next year's elections. The **2,395 people** that have signed this petition will influence when consideration is given to the apathy of the voting population of Southend. Based on the result and turnout of the 2012 elections (36,920 voters), this will represent an influence of almost **7%** of the voting electorate.

The CCTV vehicles operate outside the guidelines of the 2004 Traffic Management Act as set out by the Secretary of State. They contravene the act by operating where it is entirely possible for CEO's to fulfil the same respective duties and they do not affix the Penalty Charge Notice to the offender's vehicle. It is not possible for them to comply with this element of the act because APCOA issue the PCNs from a remote office.

In order to be compliant with the 2004 Traffic Management Act and satisfy public concern, we suggest that the two CCTV vehicles be replaced by 10 additional CEOs. The CCTV vehicles currently run at an annual operating cost of over £220,000. The deployment of 10 additional CEOs will not only produce a cost saving but also increase safety around our schools. 10 CEOs can police 10 schools in a morning and 10 in an afternoon, equating to 20 schools a day and 100 per week. This means that of the 58 schools in the borough, each school can receive a visit from a CEO on 2 occasions per week compared to one visit in almost 3 weeks by a CCTV vehicle.

Similarly Disabled Blue Badge Holders have been unfairly discriminated against due to the fact that a camera is unable to see inside a windscreen. Many Blue Badge Holders have been victimised on multiple occasions which can be negated by the human element of parking enforcement.

"An objection to the accounts of SBC is currently being considered by electors as there are concerns over whether the procurement of these mobile enforcement vehicles breaches UK and EU contract law. It goes without saying that should SBC consider removal of these vehicles then any objection would be unnecessary."

Return communication to:
Petition Coordinator
Bob Wells
185 – 187, Woodgrange Drive,
Southend-on-Sea,
Essex Ss1 2SF
Tel: 01702 600720

TS

PETITION TO SOUTHEND-ON-SEA BOROUGH COUNCIL

The signatories below are requesting a complete review of the purpose and actions of the Camera Car for the following reasons:

The Camera Car is causing chaos and disruption to many residents and businesses of the town. It photographs and drives on and has no interest in whether there is a valid reason for what it is photographing. It is contributing to a breakdown of the local community by the indiscriminate issuing of tickets and **in many cases – unfairly.**

Traffic Wardens interpret situations and apply common sense and discretion. ie Breakdowns, Flat Tyres, invalid being dropped off by a taxi and numerous other similar incidents.

To state that the accused can appeal and risk the fine being doubled to £70 is simply not right.

The Camera Car's set route preys on parades of small businesses and shops. This affects their competitive position against The Supermarkets, The Internet and businesses from other towns.

The Camera Car is making it difficult for people to go about their daily business and is making Southend a worse place to live.

WE BELIEVE THAT THIS IS A TOTAL MISSUSE OF TECHNOLOGY

These and many other issues must be considered during the review

Name	Address	Signature	State if work or study in Southend - If not Southend resident
K. PHILLIPS	184 SHAFTESBURY AVE	K PHILLIPS	Yes ✓
J. Bowers	Norwich Avenue	J Bowers	Yes ✓
N HOWLETT	SPELHAM RD	N Howlett	YES
L. Burgess	High Street, Wokeing	L Burgess	Yes ✓
LEO	Woodgrange Drive	[illegible]	RESIDENT
TINA	Woodgrange Drive	[illegible]	YES
Michael	Kensington RD	[illegible]	WORKS
MAYA	32A SS2 5EW	[illegible]	WORK.
	Lisa Battenbee	L Battenbee	" "
Steve Collins	385 Woodgrange Drive	[illegible]	
Jo Collins	385 Woodgrange Drive	[illegible]	
D. Tomlinson	210 Woodgrange Drive	D. Tomlinson	Work
G Chan	137A The Broadway Thorpe	G Chan	Work
D. Tomlinson	35 Ruskin Avenue	D. Tomlinson	living in Work
R Stallard	210 Woodgrange Drive	R Stallard	Work
M SCALLET	71 PARK STREET	M Scallet	YES ✓
S. HAIDER	280 WOODGRANGE DRIVE	[illegible]	YES
A Cornell	280 Woodgrange Drive.	[illegible]	Yes
D. WALLINGS	10 CENTRAL AVENUE - S.O.S.	[illegible]	Yes.

19