

DRAFT

Mr Philip Rutnam
 Permanent Secretary
 Department for Transport
 Great Minster House
 33 Horseferry Road
 London
 SW1P 4DR

Date:
 My ref: PH/
 Your ref:
 Contact: Phil Crossland
 Phone: 0116 305 7000
 Email: phil.crossland@leics.gov.uk

Dear Mr Rutnam

Community Speed Enforcement

Leicestershire County Council published a Cabinet Report on Community Speed Enforcement on the 2 February and the report was considered by members on the 10th February. Members resolved that I should write to you to seek clarification on a number of points. The reports are available at:

<http://politics.leics.gov.uk/documents/s126328/FINAL%20-%20Community%20Speed%20Enforcement.pdf>

<http://politics.leics.gov.uk/documents/s126311/Appendix%20-%20Community%20Speed%20Enforcement%20Leaflet.pdf>

Following its publication, local media interest led to the Department of Transport issuing the following press statement:

Guidance

- *This is not the case. It is not correct to say speed cameras can only be used in areas where there have been specific incidents, although our non-binding guidance says this is best practice.*

Factual information

- *It is up to the Highways Authority and the police to decide whether to use cameras and how they wish to operate them. Guidance was issued in 2007 entitled Use of speed and red-light camera for traffic enforcement: guidance on deployment, visibility and signing. This can be viewed here <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/use-of-speed-and-red-light-cameras-for-traffic-enforcement-guidance-on-deployment-visibility-and-signing>*
- *This guidance is not mandatory but in October 2015 the Department for Transport wrote to local authorities drawing it to their attention.*
- *In 2011 the Government asked local authorities to publish on their websites details of specific camera sites. Almost all local authorities with camera sites have published some information and a recently updated list of these websites is at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/fixed-speed-camera-collision-casualty-and-speed-data>*

Environment & Transport Department
 Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicestershire. LE3 8RJ
 Telephone: 0116 305 7000

Director: Phil Crossland

www.leicestershire.gov.uk

It may be useful if I clarify what the County Council is proposing and seek formal clarification on a number of points.

The County Council has an excellent track record on road safety and works proactively with its partners in the Road Safety Partnership to seek to deliver ever safer roads. However, despite this, the issue of vehicles 'speeding' remains a concern for many communities across Leicestershire. In the past three years over 500 speed-related complaints were received by the County Council's Environment and Transport Department and the effect of speeding traffic on communities is one of the most frequent issues raised with its elected members by residents. The Leicestershire Police's quarterly 'Community Based Survey' also regularly receives comments regarding speeding motorists.

Even though these instances may not give rise to recordable injury accidents, vehicles travelling at inappropriately, excessive speeds can and does make people feel unsafe, particularly those who are walking and cycling. NICE (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence) guidance notes that slower vehicle speeds help to encourage walking and cycling, ultimately improving public health.

In the past traditional traffic calming measures such as speed cushions, road humps, chicanes and significant signing and lining were introduced to address speeding issues. Although extremely useful and effective, these types of measures could be considered an outdated solution for speed management in a digital 21st century. Moreover, they are often not in keeping with the local setting, particularly in rural areas where the council are often accused of unduly urbanising the environment.

The approach Leicestershire County Council would like to champion is one often put forward by concerned communities which are blighted by the effects of speeding motorists on a daily basis. This is one of installing modern technology in the form of average speed cameras to enforce speed limits irrespective of the casualty record. These would be installed at the locations where communities have a concern and there is a proven issue of speeding vehicles. The Council would like to see the costs of the new cameras being met by the offenders, through the surpluses generated by the locally run driver education workshops (NDORS), which is currently retained locally, and the fine income which I understand is currently retained in full by the Government.

For the avoidance of doubt, we are not suggesting that fine revenue from existing sites is retained locally; we appreciate that this income forms part of Government's spending projections. What we are proposing is that for any new sites the fine income would be retained locally to fund the installation of the cameras, and that the County Council would forward-fund the installation of those cameras. Once the costs have been recouped the remaining fine revenue would then revert to the Government.

Please could you clarify the following points so that the County Council can consider how to take forward this initiative for the benefit of its communities:

1. Could you confirm if the Department would consider the widespread deployment of safety cameras at locations purely where there is a community concern and a speeding issue but no reported injury collisions, would be in line with current nationally published guidance?
2. If not in line with nationally published guidance, could you confirm that locally the Road Safety Partnership is able to agree to implement speed cameras at locations that are a community concern, even when there are no reported injury accidents?
3. Could you confirm if such an approach could be taken by a single highway authority or whether it would need to be approved by all members of the local road safety partnership?
4. If such an approach to the deployment of cameras was adopted, and not considered to be in line with nationally published guidance, please could you confirm what the legal position may be in terms of potential challenges against any prosecutions brought using the evidence collected from the cameras installed under this approach?
5. Could you confirm whether the Government would consider using new fine revenue arising from the approach outlined above to reimburse local highway authorities for the installation costs of new speed cameras?

In order to prove the concept of such an approach the County Council is considering the implementation of a trial scheme or schemes to study both the effect on speeding levels both within the area and on adjacent roads and also to identify the likely payback periods that may be required should the new fine revenue be made available by the Government.

The County Council would be happy to work in partnership with the DfT to trial the concepts outlined above.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter. Please note that the Council's Cabinet has asked for this letter to be copied to all Leicestershire Members of Parliament, which I have done.

Yours sincerely



Phil Crossland
Director of Environment and Transport

This page is intentionally left blank