



**Surrey Safety Camera Partnership**  
**LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR WOKING**  
**19 January 2005**

**KEY ISSUE:**

The County Council's Executive have approved the formation of a Safety Camera Partnership. This report describes the benefits of forming a Safety Camera Partnership in Surrey, and the implications for Woking.

**SUMMARY:**

Safety Cameras have been used in Surrey since 1995 and have enjoyed considerable success in reducing casualties on Surrey's roads. The creation of a Safety Camera Partnership will allow partners to recoup the cost of safety camera enforcement from fines generated from offenders running red lights or exceeding speed limits at locations with a continuing history of collisions. The Safety Camera Partnership will also be able to invest in educational campaigns in a bid to change driver behaviour and increase awareness of the Safety Camera Partnership.

Safety Camera Partnerships have to operate under strict Government rules to ensure that safety camera enforcement is visible, and focussed

on casualty reduction. In addition to proposals for a number of new sites conforming to strict criteria, all existing sites have been reviewed to assess whether enforcement is still appropriate. Consequently it is proposed that some fixed speed camera sites are removed, including one in Pyrford Road in Woking Borough, and alternative speed management measures such as vehicle-activated signs are installed instead.

**CONSULTATIONS:**

Not applicable.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Committee is asked to note

- (i) the benefits of the creation of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership.**
- (ii) that the existing red light violation camera housing located on the A320 Victoria Way junction with Chobham Road be retained and minor improvements undertaken to improve access for operatives, paid for by Surrey Safety Camera Partnership.**
- (iii) that a vehicle-activated sign be installed to replace the existing fixed speed camera housing on Pyrford Road.**
- (iv) that the above proposals are subject to approval by central government.**

## **INTRODUCTION and BACKGROUND**

1. On the 13 April 2004 the County Council's Executive approved the following recommendations;
  - a. The formation of a Safety Camera Partnership in Surrey.
  - b. Responsibility for the Governance of the partnership and approval of the operational case is delegated to Head of Transportation in consultation with the Executive Member for Transportation.
2. The following report describes the benefits of forming the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership. The governance and role of the different partners within the Partnership are described along with explanation of the effectiveness and principles for the use of safety cameras in Surrey. The implications for the Borough of Woking are then described.

## **ANALYSIS AND COMMENTARY**

### **The Partners**

3. Surrey Safety Camera Partnership has been created by the following four public sector organisations who have joined together to combine and coordinate resources to reduce collisions and casualties on Surrey's roads through safety camera enforcement, supported by educational campaigns.
  - Surrey County Council
  - Surrey Police
  - Her Majesty's Courts Service
  - The Highways Agency
4. Surrey County Council is the lead partner and is the main Highway Authority in the partnership area, with responsibility for all local roads. Surrey 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.
5. Surrey Police are responsible for providing roads policing and safety management in the partnership area. The Central Ticket Office 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.
6. 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.

7. 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 roads.

### **Why have a Safety Camera Partnership?**

8. Safety cameras have been used in Surrey since 1995. There are currently a total of 23 sites or stretches of road enforced using 24 fixed speed camera housings. At one of these sites there are two camera housings to allow enforcement in both directions at the same time, and at four other sites a single camera housing can be swivelled to allow enforcement in each direction on separate occasions.
9. There are also 11 traffic signal junction sites where red light violation cameras are deployed, using 12 camera housings (at one site two housings are used to enforce on two arms of the same junction).
10. In addition to fixed camera sites, there is a Police Casualty Reduction Officer and mobile enforcement van in each of the 11 Districts or Boroughs in Surrey. The mobile enforcement vans are currently used for a range of traffic enforcement and driver education activities, of which mobile speed enforcement is just one.
11. Overall the red light violation cameras have achieved a 62 per cent reduction in killed or serious injury (KSI) collisions, and 14 per cent reduction in personal injury collisions following implementation, and the fixed speed camera sites have achieved a 43 per cent reduction in KSI, and 28 per cent reduction in personal injury collisions (comparing the average number of collisions per year during the three years prior to installation, with the average number of collisions per year following installation to June 2004).
12. Road safety and traffic continues to be a major issue in Surrey. Wide-ranging consultation by the county council documented in the joint road safety strategy with Surrey Police indicates that “dangerous roads” are among the top ten problems on which residents and businesses want action.
13. Clearly the use of safety cameras has the potential for excellent reduction in road casualties and should also assist in reducing resident’s fear of traffic, particularly speed. In the past however, the cost of providing and operating safety cameras (red light violation and speed cameras) was borne by the partner organisations, and ultimately the taxpayer. This meant that the partners did not always have the resources available to provide effective enforcement at locations where there was a continuing history of serious collisions.
14. The creation of a Safety Camera Partnership will allow the partners to combine their efforts and recoup the cost of visible safety camera enforcement at Surrey’s most dangerous locations through the fines

generated by the cameras. The Safety Camera Partnership will also be able to invest in educational campaigns in a bid to alter driver behaviour and increase awareness of safety cameras. It should be noted that the Treasury retains any surplus fine revenue should any be generated by the Partnership.

15. Safety Camera Partnerships have to operate under strict Government rules to ensure that safety camera enforcement is visible, and focussed on casualty reduction. Also, an important principle adopted by the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership is that safety cameras should not be seen as a universal remedy for casualty reduction, but instead as only one part of the road safety “toolbox”, consisting of a range of engineering, education and enforcement measures.

## **Governance**

16. A Partnership Board directs the Partnership, upon which all partners are represented. The lead representative from Surrey Police chairs the Board. The Head of Surrey County Council’s Traffic and Road Safety Group represents Surrey County Council, who are the lead partner for the project. A Project Working Group consisting of key members of staff from each of the partners also meets regularly in order to coordinate Partnership operations and activities. A Project Office consisting of a Project Manager and Communications Manager are responsible for the day-to-day running of the Partnership.

## **Operational Case**

17. Each year the Partnership has to submit an operational case to central government outlining a review of Surrey’s existing safety cameras and any proposals for new safety cameras at locations with a continuing history of serious collisions. The operational case also contains a description of the principles behind the Partnership, forecast expenditure and a description of how costs will be recovered from forecast fixed penalty notice receipts.
18. The Safety Camera Partnership’s communications strategy forms an important part of the operational case and is designed to educate drivers and raise awareness of safety cameras, including the dangers of exceeding the speed limit and red light violations at traffic signal junctions.

## **Timetable**

19. At the time of writing, the Partnership Project Office colleagues are negotiating and finalising the Partnership’s operational case with the Department for Transport. This will then be submitted to the National Programme Board, consisting of representatives from various central government departments, for final approval during January 2005.
20. Following approval, the setting up of the Partnership will begin in earnest, and the Partnership will “go live” on 1 April 2005.

## The Use of Safety Cameras in Surrey

21. There are three types of safety camera that will be used by the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership:
- **Red Light Violation** cameras are used to tackle a continuing history of serious collisions at a junction, associated with drivers passing illegally through red traffic light signals.
  - **Fixed speed cameras** are used to tackle a continuing history of serious collisions along a short stretch of road, associated with drivers illegally exceeding the speed limit.
  - **Mobile speed cameras** are also used to tackle a continuing history of serious collisions associated with drivers illegally exceeding the speed limit, but on a longer stretch of road. The mobile speed camera can be deployed at different locations at different times along the same stretch.
22. There are strict government criteria for the introduction of new “core” safety camera sites. This is designed to ensure that the primary, overriding focus of Safety Camera Partnerships will be to reduce serious collisions and casualties, and only after all other methods have been considered.
23. In summary, the criteria for new safety camera sites is as follows:
- **Red light violation camera site:** at least 2 collisions in which someone has been killed or seriously injured at the junction, over a three-year period.
  - **Fixed speed camera site:** at least 4 collisions per km in which someone has been killed or seriously injured over a length of between 0.4 and 1.5km, over a three-year period.
  - **Mobile speed camera site:** at least 2 collisions per km in which someone has been killed or seriously injured over a length of between 0.4 and 5 km, over a three-year period.
  - For the speed enforcement sites, speed surveys must show that 20% of drivers are exceeding the speed limit and that the 85th percentile speed is above the ACPO threshold for speed enforcement of 10% + 2 mph.
24. In addition to “core” safety camera sites, the partners are also able to identify and agree a smaller number of “exceptional” sites. These are sites where there is serious local concern over the effects of speeding offenders or red light violation offenders, and where the number of collisions is high but are of insufficient severity to conform to the criteria above.
25. However, enforcement at “exceptional” sites is not allowed to exceed 15% of the total number of live camera hours spent enforcing at “core” sites. Again this will ensure that the primary, overriding focus of the Partnership will be to reduce serious collisions and casualties.

## Visible Enforcement Rules

26. In order to be part of the Safety Camera Programme, all safety camera housings have to conform to strict signing, visibility and conspicuity rules. This includes the rule that all the fixed speed safety camera housings have to be coloured yellow, and mobile enforcement vehicles have to be liveried with Partnership insignia. The Partnership Communications Strategy also contains proposals to advertise to drivers where camera sites are located. This supports the principle that the Safety Camera Programme will be based upon visible enforcement, ensuring maximum opportunity for drivers to keep to speed limits.

## Covert Enforcement (outside of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership)

27. In addition to the visible enforcement supported by the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership, there can be situations where the police judge that covert enforcement is necessary, such as when extreme motorists reconnoitre roads for cameras prior to using them for high speed racing. In addition to the Safety Camera Partnership, Surrey Police will continue to have 11 Casualty Reduction Officers - one in each Borough or District, who will be able to react to local concerns over speeding. In these situations covert enforcement will be a police matter separate from the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership activity. Fine revenue and costs of covert enforcement are not recoverable.

## Proposals for the First Year of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership

### New “Core” Sites

28. Following a process involving detailed analysis of collision data, site surveys, and consideration of the site characteristics (undertaken in partnership between Surrey County Council Road Safety Engineers and Surrey Police Safety Management Officers), Surrey Safety Camera Partnership have applied for approval for a number of new “core” camera enforcement sites. The locations and collision history of each of these new core sites is listed in Tables 1 to 3.

**Table 1: Proposed Red Light Violation Camera Sites**

Location	3 year collision data ending June 2004	
	KSI* collisions	Total personal injury collisions
A25 Ladymead junction with A322 Woodbridge Rd, Guildford. (West & eastbound enforcement)	3	16

\* Killed or Seriously Injured

**Table 2: Proposed Fixed Speed Camera Sites**

Location	Speed limit	3 year collision data ending June 2004		Speed data (measured within last 6 months)	
		KSI* collisions/ km	Personal injury collisions / km	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile speed	% of vehicles over the speed limit
A24 Mickleham By-Pass, Mickleham (Eastbound enforcement)	50	4	39	62	59

\* Killed or Seriously Injured

**Table 3: Proposed Mobile Speed Camera Sites**

Location	Speed limit	3 year collision data ending June 2004		Speed data (measured within last 6 months)	
		KSI* collisions/ km	Personal injury collisions / km	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile speed	% of vehicles over the speed limit
C248 Kingston Road, Staines (Eastbound & Westbound enforcement)	30	2	19	37	59
A308 Staines By-Pass, Staines (Eastbound enforcement)	50	3	4	65	70
A31 Hogs Back (A3T-B3000 Compton) (Eastbound and westbound enforcement)	60	2	12	73	61
A31 Hogs Back (B3000-C21 Seale) (Eastbound and westbound enforcement)	60	2	10	73	65

\* Killed or Seriously Injured



## Review of “Legacy” Sites

29. This year will be Surrey’s first application to be accepted on to the national safety camera programme, therefore all the existing (“legacy”) safety camera sites in Surrey were reviewed to assess which should be retained, and which are no longer appropriate. The review was conducted by Surrey Police Safety Management Officers and Surrey County Council road safety engineers and included consideration of:
- Any changes in the characteristics of the site
  - A comparison of collision data before and after installation
  - The level of enforcement undertaken at the site
  - Any possible alternatives to safety camera enforcement
30. Following the review of the 11 junctions in Surrey where red light violation cameras are currently in operation, it is proposed that all of these should be retained, albeit with some minor changes to improve health and safety access for operatives at some locations, and/or some changes in the level of enforcement provided at some of the sites. Following the review of the 23 existing fixed speed camera sites; it is proposed to remove 7 sites, (enforced using 8 camera housings), where it is considered that safety camera enforcement is no longer appropriate.

## Implications for Woking Local Transportation Area

31. Currently there is one red light safety camera housing at the A320 Victoria Way junction with Chobham Road. It is proposed that this be retained, albeit with some minor changes to improve health and safety access for operatives to allow enforcement to be undertaken.
32. There is also one fixed speed camera housing on Pyrford Road near to the junction with Thorley Gardens. It is proposed that this camera be removed, and a vehicle-activated sign be installed instead. Vehicle-activated signs are signs that light up to drivers who are approaching too fast to remind them of the speed limit, or to warn of a particular hazard ahead.
33. The reasoning behind the proposal to remove this safety camera housing is based upon the history of collisions at this location, and a consideration of possible alternative speed management measures that could be applied instead. The safety camera housing was installed in December 2001 and Table 4 overleaf shows the history of collisions occurring along the one km stretch at this site in the three years prior to installation. It can be seen that there were no collisions involving death or serious injury, and just three personal injury collisions in total in the three years prior to installation. In fact there have been no collisions involving death or serious injury at this site since 1987.

**Table 4: Collision history at Pyrford Road Safety Camera Site**

Location	3 year collision data prior to installation (ending December 2001)	
	KSI* collisions/ km	Total personal injury collisions (including KSI)/km
Pyrford Road, Woking (northbound enforcement)	0	3

\* Killed or Seriously Injured

34. This can be contrasted to the collision record at the proposed new fixed speed camera site on the Mickleham bypass shown in Table 2, where there were 4 KSI collisions per km and 39 personal injury collisions per km in the last three years. Clearly the use of safety camera enforcement at Pyrford Road does not comply with the principle that safety camera enforcement should be reserved for the most dangerous locations with a continuing history of serious collisions. Retaining this safety camera site would bring the use of safety camera enforcement by the new Surrey Safety Camera Partnership into disrepute.
35. The development of vehicle-activated signs in recent years provides the opportunity to replace the Pyrford Road safety camera with a cost effective alternative. The Transport Research Laboratory have conducted extensive research into the use of vehicle-activated signs and found that they successfully reduced mean speeds, and there was overwhelming approval of the signs from drivers<sup>1</sup>. The use of vehicle-activated signs also supports the principle that safety cameras are one of a range of measures, and not a universal remedy to collision reduction.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

36. The creation of Surrey Safety Camera Partnership will allow the Partners (including Surrey County Council) to recoup the cost of providing and operating visible safety camera enforcement from the fines generated from red light running and speeding offences rather than from taxes. The Central Government's Treasury will retain any surplus revenue should any be generated by the Partnership.
37. In Woking it is proposed that the red light safety camera housing at the A320 Victoria Way junction with Chobham Road is retained, but that some minor improvements are undertaken (paid for by the Partnership), to improve health and safety access for operatives to enable enforcement.

---

<sup>1</sup> Winnett, M. Wheeler, A.H. (2002) Vehicle Activated Signs – a large-scale evaluation, TRL Report 548: Crowthorne, TRL Limited.

38. It is also proposed that a vehicle-activated sign be installed in place of the existing safety camera housing on Pырford Road. Surrey Safety Camera Partnership are seeking funding for this (typical cost of about £7,000) from the County Council's central 2005/2006 Local Transport Plan allocation. (Under government rules, Safety Camera Partnerships can fund the provision of vehicle-activated signs, but only where they are provided in conjunction with safety cameras. Therefore, the Partnership will not be allowed to fund the vehicle-activated sign proposed for Pырford Road).

## **SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS**

39. None.

## **CRIME & DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

40. Crime and Disorder surveys of Surrey residents have revealed that the fear of traffic and dangerous roads are of prime concern. The creation of the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership will allow for an increase in resources to provide effective safety camera enforcement to tackle collisions and casualties resulting from speeding and red light running. The Surrey Safety Camera partnership will also be able to invest in educational campaigns in a bid to change driver behaviour and increase awareness of the Safety Camera Partnership.

## **EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

41. None.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

42. Surrey County Council, Surrey Police, Her Majesty's Court Service and the Highways Agency have joined together to create the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership. The aim of the Partnership will be to reduce collisions and casualties on Surrey's roads through safety camera enforcement supported by educational campaigns. If proposals to central government are accepted in January, the Partners will be able to recoup the costs of safety camera enforcement from the fines generated by red light running and speeding drivers, starting from April 2005. However the use and provision of safety cameras has to satisfy government criteria to ensure that the Partnership is focussed on casualty reduction through visible enforcement.
43. An important principle adopted by the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership is that safety cameras should be used at the most dangerous locations where there is a continuing history of collisions, and after all other cost effective options have been considered, or are exhausted. Safety cameras should be seen as only one part of the road safety "toolbox", consisting of a range of engineering, education and enforcement measures.

44. As well as proposals to introduce a number of new enforcement sites, Surrey County Council road safety engineers and Surrey Police Safety Management Officers have reviewed all existing “legacy” sites. The majority of these will be retained, however it is proposed that a small number are removed where it is considered that enforcement is no longer appropriate.
45. In Woking it is proposed that the existing red light violation camera located on Victoria Way junction with Chobham Road be retained. It is also proposed that a vehicle-activated sign be installed to replace an existing fixed speed safety camera housing on Pyrford Road, where Surrey Police Safety Management Officers and Surrey County Council Road Safety Engineers agree that continued enforcement by safety camera is no longer appropriate. Under government rules it is not permitted for the Surrey Safety Camera Partnership to fund this sign, so funding is being sought from the Council’s central 2005/2006 Local Transport Plan allocation.

**Report by: Stephen Child, Local Transportation Director.**

---

**LEAD/CONTACT OFFICER:**        **Duncan Knox**, Project Manager, Surrey Safety Camera Partnership

**TELEPHONE NUMBER:**        **020 8541 7443**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:**        **None**

---

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