



OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE (MOLE VALLEY)

Surrey Safety Camera Partnership: Update and Proposals for Mole Valley

9 December 2009

KEY ISSUE

In order to tackle the high number of road collisions, excessive speeds, and the high level of public concern over these issues along the A24 between Dorking and Beare Green, the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership are proposing to install two roadside hard standings to allow mobile camera units to be deployed to provide speed enforcement on this route.

SUMMARY

The Surrey Safety Camera Partnership consists of four public sector organisations who have joined together with the aim of reducing death and injury on Surrey's roads through the use of safety camera enforcement to deter speeding and red light jumping, supported by road safety education, campaigning and publicity.

This report provides an update on the work of the Partnership and includes an explanation of the role of the partners, the governance of the Partnership, funding, the principles in the Partnership's use of safety cameras and how effective they are in reducing road collisions.

It also describes proposals for two roadside hard standings on the A24 in Mole Valley which would allow mobile camera units to be deployed to provide speed enforcement on this route.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to agree that:

- (i) £70,000 of the £200,000 central capital budget allocated to the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership in 2009/2010 is invested to provide two hard standings protected by safety fencing to allow mobile speed camera enforcement vehicles to be deployed on the A24:
 - 1 One located upon the wide central reserve of the A24 in North Holmwood, in the vicinity of the junction with Spook Hill.
 - 2 One located upon the nearside grass verge of the southbound carriageway on the approach to Beare Green, opposite the junction with Old Horsham Road.

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Introduction

- 1.1 The Surrey Safety Camera Partnership, launched in April 2005, consists of four public sector organisations who have joined together with the aim of reducing death and injury on Surrey's roads using safety cameras to deter speeding and red light jumping, supported by road safety campaigning and publicity.

Role of Partners

- 1.2 Surrey County Council is the lead partner and is the main highway authority in the partnership area, with responsibility for all local roads. Accordingly the County Council is responsible for the provision and maintenance of all safety camera housings and safe roadside locations for mobile enforcement vehicles on local roads. As the lead partner the County Council also employ a project team with responsibility for overall project management and coordination.
- 1.3 Surrey Police are responsible for providing roads policing and road safety management in Surrey. The safety camera unit of Surrey Police is responsible for deployment of cameras in safety camera housings, the processing of speeding and red light offences, and issuing of fixed penalty notices.
- 1.4 Her Majesty's Court Service has responsibility for the administration of the magistrates' courts in Surrey. The Surrey Fines and Enforcement Unit deals with all matters relating to enquiry and payments facilities for the County, including fixed penalty notices.
- 1.5 The Highways Agency is an executive agency of the Department for Transport and is responsible for motorways and trunk roads. The Highways Agency is responsible for the provision and maintenance of safety camera housings and safe roadside locations for mobile enforcement vehicles on these strategic roads. Safety camera enforcement is often provided on major road works schemes taking place on Highways Agency roads.
- 1.6 Although Surrey Safety Camera Partnership colleagues work closely with colleagues in Surrey Highways and Surrey Police, the Partnership is not directly responsible for the following:
- Other police traffic enforcement work.
 - Camera enforcement of the variable speed limit section of the M25. (This is undertaken by the Metropolitan Police).
 - Community Speed Watch.
 - Police Automatic Number Plate Recognition mobile camera units.
 - Installation and maintenance of vehicle activated signs. (Although the Partnership has provided funding for the installation of vehicle-activated signs on the approach to camera sites, these are maintained by Surrey Highways).

Governance

- 1.7 A Project Board directs the Partnership, upon which all partners are represented. The manager of Surrey County Council's Network Management and Information Group within Transport for Surrey represents Surrey County Council. The Project Board usually meets once every quarter.
- 1.8 The County Council employ a Project Office consisting of a Project Manager, Communications Officer and Engineer/Data Officer to be responsible for the day-to-day running of the Partnership. This includes coordination of Partners in operating existing sites, assessment of potential new sites, monitoring, campaigning and public relations. The Project Manager is responsible for monitoring the overall budget of the Partnership and for reporting to the Project Board.

Types of Safety Camera

- 1.9 There are now several different types of safety camera that have been type approved by the Home Office and are being used by the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership:
- 1.10 **Fixed spot speed cameras** - these are used at sites where collisions are clustered around a particular point or location and where speeds have been measured and found to be excessive.
- 1.11 **Mobile speed camera zones** - these are stretches of road where collisions have been scattered along a length of road and where speeds have been measured and found to be a problem. Typically mobile enforcement vehicles will make visits to different locations within the zone on different days. Mobile enforcement can also be used to complement fixed spot speed enforcement (for example in the opposite direction to the fixed camera, or beyond the fixed speed camera).
- 1.12 **Red light violation cameras** - these are used at traffic signal junctions where collisions have been recorded due to vehicles failing to comply with red traffic signals.
- 1.13 **Combined speed and red light violation cameras** - these are used at traffic signal junctions where collisions have been recorded due to vehicles failing to comply with red traffic signals and where speeds have been measured and found to be excessive when the signals are on green.
- 1.14 **Average speed camera sites** - these are used to manage speeds over a longer stretch of road where most typically there are only a small number of entry and exit points. These systems are, for now, comparatively expensive and most often used during major roadwork schemes where the equipment is hired by the Highways Agency on a temporary basis.

Criteria for New Safety Camera Sites

Casualty Reduction

- 1.15 Collisions are random events, and relatively rare. Although we do not know when or where the next collision is going to take place exactly, we do know that there are certain locations or stretches of road that are more likely to suffer collisions in the future because of the history of collisions occurring there in the past. It is these “collision hotspots” that can usually be ameliorated through implementation of engineering and/or enforcement measures. Therefore an important principle of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership is that core enforcement is reserved for the very worst collision hotspots where excessive speed or red light violations have been confirmed as a problem.
- 1.16 The criteria used for selecting new core sites are described within guidance issued by the Department for Transport (Circular 01/2007: Use of Speed and Red-Light Cameras for Traffic Enforcement: Guidance on Deployment, Visibility and Signing). An extract of the guidance describing the criteria is shown in Annex 1 (The full guidance is available to download via the Partnership’s website www.surrey-safecam.org). In summary the criteria uses a points system, with a greater weighting for collisions involving death or serious injury. A minimum number of points are required before the introduction of a new core enforcement site. For speed enforcement locations, speed surveys are also required to confirm and assess the extent of the problem. Safety cameras are only introduced as a last resort after sites have been assessed and approved by both Police and County Council road safety professionals.

Public Reassurance

- 1.17 In addition to the core sites that comply with criteria described above, mobile enforcement is also undertaken from time to time at other sites where there has been public concern expressed over excessive speeds and road safety, so long as there is a safe place to park the enforcement vehicle at the side of the road. These are known as exceptional sites, and are typically enforced on a less regular basis either by the Partnership’s own mobile enforcement police officers or by local Casualty Reduction Police Officers. If mobile enforcement vehicles are unable to deploy to the site because there is insufficient room, then local police colleagues will be notified in case other non-camera interventions could be considered instead. These may include community speed watch, hand held radar enforcement or the deployment of vehicle activated signs. The Casualty Reduction Officer for Mole Valley is PC2617 Tom Arthur.
- 1.18 As well as ensuring the most effective use of resources, and the most effective casualty reduction results, this data-led approach focussing on the very worst collision hotspots (while also providing exceptional enforcement from time to time in response to public concerns) helps to maintain public support for the use of safety cameras. The County Council’s Executive has endorsed this approach.

Visible Enforcement

- 1.19 An important principle of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership is that enforcement is as visible and conspicuous as possible. The aim is to persuade and encourage motorists to stick to speed limits, rather than have to issue penalties. As far as the Partnership is concerned, the most successful safety camera site is one where drivers are aware of the speed limit and of the enforcement, and then speeds are slower and there are fewer penalties and fewer casualties as a result. The County Council's Executive has endorsed this principle.
- 1.20 A full explanation of the national guidance that the Partnership follows to ensure that enforcement is visible is available to download via the Partnership's website www.surrey-safecam.org. In summary the Partnership ensures that all camera installations are positioned to be visible to drivers. Fixed cameras are yellow, and mobile camera units are conspicuously liveried. Conventional road signs displaying the speed limit combined with a safety camera warning symbol are positioned on the approach to all cameras so that this sign is visible to the driver at the same time as the camera.
- 1.21 In addition to this the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership is particularly proud of the fact that there is a vehicle activated sign that will illuminate to display the speed limit and warn of enforcement on the approach to nearly all the core speed camera enforcement sites in Surrey. There is a map of camera locations on the Partnership website www.surrey-safecam.org that contains photos of every single core enforcement site within Surrey showing how each site conforms to the Partnership's principle of visible enforcement.
- 1.22 If however, despite all the warnings, drivers continue to substantially exceed the limit then they face the risk of being issued with a penalty.

Road Safety Campaigning, Publicity And Education

- 1.23 The Surrey Safety Camera Partnership believes that education of road users is a vital part of the drive to reduce road casualties. A communications plan to help change driver behaviour related to excessive speeding and red light running, and to demonstrate the role safety cameras play in preventing casualties, is implemented on an annual basis. A range of media and campaign activities targeting specific higher risk groups within the driving population as well as the general public are undertaken. The opinions of Surrey residents are monitored through an annual survey, the results of which inform future campaigns and activities.
- 1.24 Funding from the Drive Smart anti-social driving initiative has been invested to be able to start offering speed awareness courses to low-end speeders starting from December 2009. Any low end speeders issued with a Notice of Intended prosecution as a result of being detected speeding within the range of the speed limit+10%+2mph up to the speed limit+10%+6mph, (ie from 35 to 39 mph in a 30 mph limit zone) will be offered the opportunity to attend a speed awareness course rather than be issued with three points and a £60 fine. The cost of attending the course is expected to be about £75 and drivers are not allowed to attend the course more than once in any three-year period.

2 ANALYSIS

National Research on Safety Cameras

- 2.1 There is overwhelming national and international research evidence published by independent academics that safety cameras are effective at encouraging slower speeds and reducing casualties at collision hotspots. The most comprehensive research in the UK was undertaken by PA Consulting with University College London, University of Liverpool, and Napier University, and considered several years worth of data for over 4,000 camera sites across Britain. The full report can be downloaded from the Partnership's website www.surrey-safecam.org. In summary it was found:
- **Vehicle speeds were down** – surveys showed that vehicle speeds at speed camera sites had dropped by around 6% following the introduction of cameras. At new sites, there was a 31% reduction in vehicles breaking the speed limit. At fixed sites, there was a 70% reduction and at mobile sites there was an 18% reduction. Overall, the proportion of vehicles speeding excessively (i.e. 15mph more than the speed limit) fell by 91% at fixed camera sites, and 36% at mobile camera sites.
 - **Both casualties and deaths were down** – after allowing for the long-term trend, but without allowing for selection effects (such as regression-to-mean) there was a 22% reduction in personal injury collisions at sites after cameras were introduced. Overall 42% fewer people were killed or seriously injured. At camera sites, there was also a reduction of over 100 fatalities per annum (32% fewer). There were 1,745 fewer people killed or seriously injured and 4,230 fewer personal injury collisions per annum in 2004. There was an association between reductions in speed and reductions in personal injury collisions.
- 2.2 An oft-repeated, invalid criticism of the analysis of safety cameras is that the reported casualty reductions can be explained by the effect of "regression to mean". This is where it is claimed that the reduction in collisions would have occurred even if enforcement were not provided, because the larger number of collisions beforehand was purely down to chance rather than a long-term problem that has been addressed by the provision of enforcement. However the research report referred to above included analysis on a subset of 317 sites to take into account possible regression-to-mean effects and found that the safety effects of cameras remain substantial. The fact that speeds have been measured and have shown to be reduced as a result of enforcement supports the assertion that casualty reductions are due to some real observed effect (i.e. the reduction in speeds) rather than just chance.
- 2.3 It is worth pointing out too that the effect of regression-to-mean is just as applicable to any other highway safety scheme interventions that have been introduced as a result of collision hotspot selection and investigation, whether they be pedestrian crossings, roundabouts, vehicle activated signs or anti-skid surfacing, better drainage, lighting or signing. It is hard to think of any other road safety intervention that has been more thoroughly researched and scrutinised by independent academics, yet still found to be effective.

Collision Monitoring Results at Core Camera Sites in Surrey

2.4 The following describes the safety camera equipment and sites in use throughout Surrey (as of November 2009).

- **Fixed cameras (wet film)**
26 fixed speed housings, 6 cameras
11 red light camera housings, 2 cameras
3 combined speed and red light housings, 2 cameras
(Wet film cameras are moved from housing to housing and dummy flash units are provided when a live camera is not present).
- **Fixed cameras (digital)**
2 fixed speed camera housings, 2 cameras
1 red light camera housing, 1 camera
2 combined speed and red light housings, 2 cameras
- **Mobile enforcement vehicles and cameras**
3 full time units managed by Surrey Safety Camera Partnership
11 Casualty Reduction Officers managed by local Police
- **Temporary Road Works Enforcement**
Hindhead Tunnel works: 2 wet film fixed camera housings, 1 camera
M3 junctions 3 to 4, SPECS Average Speed Camera
M3 junction with M25, SPECS Average Speed Camera (to be made permanent)

2.5 Headline results for the collision reduction performance of core safety camera sites across Surrey to end of March 2009 are summarised below. The analysis compares the average number of collisions in the three years prior to enforcement with the most recent three-year period after enforcement. Please note that data for sites that have been in place for less than 6 months prior to March 2009 are not included in this analysis as there is not enough “after” period to make a fair comparison with “before” data.

- **Fixed Speed Camera Sites**
72% reduction in collisions resulting in death or serious injury (a reduction from 22 to 6 collisions per year at 25 sites).
47% reduction in collisions overall (a reduction from 129 to 69 collisions per year at 25 sites).
- **Combined Speed and Red Light Violation Camera Site**
100% reduction in collisions resulting in death or serious injury (a reduction from 0.3 to 0 collisions per year at 1 site).
31% reduction in collisions overall (a reduction from 4 to 3 collisions per year at 1 site).
- **Red Light Violation Camera Sites**
58% reduction in collisions resulting in death or serious injury (a reduction from 10 to 4 collisions per year at 13 sites).
14% reduction in collisions overall (a reduction from 54 to 46 collisions per year at 13 sites).

- **Mobile Speed Enforcement Camera Sites**
41% reduction in collisions resulting in death or serious injury (a reduction from 12 to 7 collisions per year at 7 sites).
22% reduction in collisions overall (a reduction from 71 to 56 collisions per year at 7 sites).
- **All Camera Enforcement Sites Combined**
61% reduction in collisions resulting in death or serious injury (a reduction from 43 to 17 collisions per year at 46 sites).
33% reduction in collisions overall (a reduction from 258 to 173 collisions per year at 46 sites).

2.6 Of particular interest to Mole Valley Members will be the safety camera enforcement site on the A24 at Mickleham. At this location, in the three-year period prior to enforcement (beginning in May 2005) there was a total of 36 collisions taking place on the 1.5km stretch of road around the current camera. These 36 collisions led to 56 casualties including 2 fatalities and 7 serious injuries. Consequently a new fixed camera, central reservation safety fencing and vehicle-activated signs were installed. The enforcement of the fixed camera has been supplemented by additional mobile camera enforcement to maintain the deterrent throughout the whole of the bends. Consequently since May 2005 (a 4.5 year period) there has been a much-reduced record of 11 collisions taking place on the same stretch of road. These 11 collisions led to 13 casualties including two serious injuries.

3 PROPOSALS FOR MOLE VALLEY

Method

- 3.1 Every time the police are informed of, or attend a road collision resulting in personal injury they complete a record detailing the circumstances of the collision within a national standard pro-forma. This information is compiled within a database and can be plotted on computer maps to allow police and County Council colleagues to identify and analyse road safety problem sites to assess what interventions may be effective.
- 3.2 Each year the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership analyses police collision data to identify which stretches of road have suffered the worst record of collisions over the most recent three years. The sites are ranked so that further detailed investigations can take place at the very worst collision hotspots to see if safety camera enforcement would be of any benefit. If collisions at a site are thought to be associated with excessive speeds, then speed surveys would be commissioned to confirm the extent of the perceived problem. If speeding is confirmed as an issue, site visits would be undertaken by Police and County Council engineers to assess potential solutions.

Analysis

- 3.3 Analysis has revealed that within Mole Valley the A24 from the Flint Hill roundabout to the Beare Green roundabout has suffered a high number of collisions. In the three years to the end of August 2009 there were 34 collisions resulting in 49 casualties including 4 fatalities and seven serious injury casualties on this 4.85km stretch. The collisions were generally spread throughout the route rather than clustered at specific locations. Although excessive speed may not have been considered the primary factor every single one of these collisions, the chances of a collision and the consequences of a collision are greatly increased with increased vehicle speeds.
- 3.4 Concerns have been raised over speeding vehicles on the A24 by residents at Police Neighbourhood panel meetings in Holmwood. Strong concerns have also been raised over the safety of school children as they make their way to The Weald Primary School alongside the A24 in Beare Green.
- 3.5 Speed surveys have been undertaken at three sites along this stretch of the A24 and the results are summarised below. These show that there were large proportions of vehicles exceeding the 60 mph speed limit, and that at some locations 15 per cent of the vehicles were travelling more than 70 mph (more than 10 mph over the speed limit). The analysis confirms that this road has a high number of collisions and suffers from a high proportion of speeding vehicles, confirming the concerns raised by residents. It meets the core criteria for enforcement by mobile safety camera units.

A24 North Holmwood, Near Holmwood Farm, April 2009

Direction	Mean speed mph	85 th percentile speed* mph	Percentage exceeding the 60 mph limit
Northbound	63	70	54
Southbound	58	66	34

A24 Mid Holmwood, Near Oaks Lane, April 2009

Direction	Mean speed mph	85 th percentile speed* mph	Percentage exceeding the 60 mph limit
Northbound	64	71	61
Southbound	62	70	53

A24 Beare Green, Near Old Horsham Road, Sept 2009

Direction	Mean speed mph	85 th percentile speed* mph	Percentage exceeding the 60 mph limit
Northbound	58	65	35
Southbound	61	69	47

* the 85th percentile speed is the speed above which the fastest 15 per cent of vehicles were travelling.

Proposals

- 3.6 Site visits have been undertaken along the route by representatives of Surrey Police Safety and Traffic Management Team, Surrey Safety Camera Partnership and local engineers from Surrey Highways to assess potential locations for safety camera enforcement vehicles to park in order to provide a deterrent to speeding along the route. Considerations included:
- That there is good visibility between the enforcement vehicle and approaching vehicles to provide a deterrent in both directions;
 - That the location can be accessed safely by the enforcement vehicle;
 - That the enforcement vehicle does not obstruct the visibility between vehicles exiting side roads and approaching vehicles;
 - That the location will help to address excessive speeds on the sections of greatest concern along the route.
 - That there is existing solid ground for the vehicle to stand on, or room to install a new hard standing;
 - The location allows the enforcement vehicle to be positioned clear from the main carriageway in order to be safe; and
 - There is room to provide protective safety fencing to protect any vehicles in case they lose control and leave the main carriageway.
- 3.7 Two locations have been identified and indicative drawings are included within Annex 2. The first hard standing is located upon the wide central reserve of the A24 in North Holmwood, in the vicinity of the junction with Spook Hill. This location would allow enforcement in both directions and will provide a deterrent at the beginning of the route for southbound vehicles. The second is located upon the nearside grass verge of the southbound carriageway on the approach to Beare Green, opposite the junction with Old Horsham Road. This location would also allow enforcement in both directions and will provide a deterrent at the beginning of the route for northbound vehicles. It will also provide a deterrent to speeding for southbound vehicles as they approach the section of road used by pupils travelling to The Weald Primary School, over which there has been a large amount of public concern expressed. There were no other locations on the route that were considered suitable.
- 3.8 The cost of installing the proposed hard standings at these two locations (along with protective safety fencing) is estimated as being about £70,000. This would be paid for from the £200,000 central capital budget allocated to the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership for investment in new safety camera sites and equipment throughout Surrey during 2009/2010.

4 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 Local Members are always informed over the intention to proceed with new camera enforcement sites through local committee reports or via the Local Highway Manager and District or Borough Communications Officers. Residents and businesses on surrounding roads are informed via letter before implementation to explain where and why enforcement is being introduced. Any relevant Resident's Associations are also informed, and new sites are also advertised in the local media.

5 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Road collisions impose a range of economic impacts on people and organisations, including:

Impacts related to the casualty:

- Medical and healthcare costs
- Lost economic
- Pain, grief and suffering

Impacts related to the collision:

- Material damage
- Police and fire service costs
- Insurance administration
- Legal and court costs

5.2 The Department for Transport provide an annual valuation of road collisions and casualties for use in economic appraisal in their annual report "Reported Road Casualties Great Britain". The average value of the prevention of road collisions in 2008 prices is given as:

	£
• Fatal injury collision:	1,906,200
• Serious injury collision:	218,100
• Slight injury collision:	22,600
• Average cost per injury collision	75,000

5.3 Collision reduction performance data (paragraph 2.5) shows an overall annual saving of 85 personal injury collisions per year at core safety camera sites. Taking the average value of prevention of a single personal injury collision of £75,000 would mean that there are savings to society of at least £6.375 million per year as a result of safety camera enforcement. This is a conservative estimate, as it only includes enforcement at core sites, and does not include exceptional enforcement undertaken on other roads from time to time. Also it does not include the savings due to reductions in damage only collisions and does not reflect the fact that camera enforcement is particularly focussed and successful in reducing the more costly serious collisions.

5.4 The Partnership is funded via an annual road safety grant provided to the County Council in addition to the usual Local Transport Plan settlement. Last year Surrey County Council were provided with a £2,007,133 road safety grant for the financial year 2008/2009, of which the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership were allocated £1,413,165. Therefore this equates to a conservative estimate of a cost benefit ratio of 4.5:1 between the amount invested in safety camera enforcement and the savings to society from reduced collisions and casualties as a result.

5.5 For clarification it is worth noting that all the fines from safety cameras are paid to the courts and go to HM Treasury. Therefore there is no financial incentive to the partner organisations or individuals working for the partnership to issue more penalties. No targets are set with regard to the issuing of penalties; instead performance is measured in terms of the number of road casualties saved.

6 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are no equalities implications. Safety cameras are, by their very nature, indiscriminate.

7 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The issue of speed and antisocial driving remains a prime concern of Surrey residents. The use of safety cameras, supported by educational campaigning and publicity aims to address these issues. Intelligence from safety cameras has been used as evidence in relation to other crime too.

8 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 Safety cameras are very effective in reducing road casualties when deployed at the right locations (where speeds and/or red light jumping are a problem), though they are not a universal remedy to all casualty hotspots. Therefore the Partnership follows criteria to ensure that enforcement is focussed upon the worst collision hotspots while also providing enforcement at many more locations in response to public concerns over speeds and road safety.
- 8.2 The enforcement is as visible as possible in order to provide a visual deterrent to speeding rather than having to issue penalties. However if despite the warnings drivers continue to substantially exceed the limit, then they face the risk of being issued with a penalty.
- 8.3 The enforcement provided by Surrey Safety Camera Partnership is supported by a programme of road safety education, campaigns and publicity to change driver behaviour and to demonstrate the role safety cameras play in preventing casualties.
- 8.4 Analysis is undertaken each year to identify locations throughout Surrey that may benefit from safety camera enforcement to reduce collisions. This has shown that the A24 from the Flint Hill roundabout to the Beare Green roundabout has suffered a high number of collisions. Surveys have confirmed concerns raised by residents that the road suffers from excessive speeds.
- 8.5 Following site visits by Surrey Police, Surrey County Council engineers and Surrey Safety Camera Partnership representatives, two locations have been found on this stretch of road that would be suitable for the installation of hardstandings to allow enforcement by mobile safety camera vehicles.

The Local Committee (Mole Valley) is asked to agree that:

- (i) £70,000 of the £200,000 central capital budget allocated to the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership is invested to provide two hard standings protected by safety fencing to allow mobile speed camera enforcement vehicles to be deployed on the A24:
- One located upon the wide central reserve of the A24 in North Holmwood, in the vicinity of the junction with Spook Hill.
 - One located upon the nearside grass verge of the southbound carriageway on the approach to Beare Green, opposite the junction with Old Horsham Road.

9 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.1 This stretch of road has suffered a high level of collisions, suffers from excessive speeding, and public concerns have been raised over road safety. Provision of hard standings to allow mobile safety camera enforcement will help to address these problems and reduce road casualties.

10 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

- 10.1 If agreed, the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership will proceed with the commissioning of the two hard standings from Surrey Highways. Speed limit and safety camera signing will be enhanced, and enforcement will be provided after being publicised and local residents have been informed.

LEAD OFFICER: Duncan Knox, Project Manager, Surrey Safety Camera Partnership
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 020 8541 7443
E-MAIL: Duncan.knox@surreycc.gov.uk
CONTACT OFFICER: As above
TELEPHONE NUMBER:
E-MAIL:
BACKGROUND PAPERS:

Version No. Date: Time: Initials: No of annexes: