

SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL**LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)**

DATE: 20 MARCH 2015
LEAD OFFICER: DUNCAN KNOX
 ROAD SAFETY TEAM MANAGER



SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO PETITION: REQUESTED INTRODUCTION OF
 AVERAGE SPEED CAMERAS IN HASLEMERE

DIVISION: HASLEMERE

SUMMARY OF ISSUE:

1. A petition was submitted to the Committee's meeting on 12 December 2014 by Mrs Victoria Leake on behalf of residents and visitors to Haslemere (58 signatures):

On 24 January 2014 a speed check was carried out by Surrey Police in Shepherds Hill, Haslemere, Surrey. According to data collected over 70% of vehicles were speeding, with some speeds reaching 59mph. We, the residents of Haslemere, petition Surrey County Council to look at introducing Siemens SafeZone in Haslemere to promote safer roads and reduce casualties in Haslemere. SafeZone combines Siemens' new Sicore Automatic License Plate Recognition camera. The systems reduce serious accidents by 77% on average. There is a high level of driver compliance (99.4%). The camera has a compact design to reduce street impact. A single camera is used for two lane bi-directional traffic which reduces the project cost. The branding and technology enable a community-based approach to enforcement. Siemens SafeZone is a scheme whereby the goal is to construct an individual and ideally self-financing solution based upon locally retained funds arising from Driver Awareness course participation.

Officer response

2. Average speed cameras such as Siemens SafeZone are undoubtedly effective in promoting a high compliance with the speed limit for through traffic passing both units. They can also force compliance by other vehicles passing only one camera if they are stuck behind platoons of vehicles that are sticking to the speed limit.
3. The County Council does not yet have a policy in place for prioritising sites for average speed camera systems, and none have yet been installed on Surrey County Council roads. The County Council's Road Safety Team advises that the policy covering spot speed cameras (yellow box cameras) follows national criteria which prioritise locations with a history of collisions resulting in serious and fatal injuries and where measured speeds are excessive. The Safety Team reports that they will be developing a policy for average speed cameras which is likely to follow similar criteria, with this new type of camera system reserved for the very worst collision hotspots where speeding has been confirmed as a problem. The reason for this approach is to maintain public support for safety cameras, and to ensure that the greatest reduction in casualties is achieved for

the money invested.

4. It is not correct to assume that any new camera site would be self financing from the fees charged to attend speed awareness courses. This is because the Police safety camera unit is already operating at maximum capacity. Consequently there would be costs in the introduction and/or operation of any new safety cameras but no easy way of increasing the processing capacity of the back office to provide increased levels of enforcement that would meet these additional costs.
5. Consequently only once a policy for new average speed camera sites is agreed by the County Council and Surrey Police would it then be possible to assess requests for new sites. This is likely to include an assessment of casualties and speeds and then funding would be required to pay for the cost of installing any new camera site. A typical two camera system is thought to cost in the region of £75,000.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Local Committee (Waverley) is asked to agree the response provided.

Contact Officer:

Duncan Knox, Road Safety Team Manager: 03456 009 009.

Consulted:

N/A

Annexes:

None

Sources/background papers: None