



STAFFORDSHIRE  
**safer roads**  
PARTNERSHIP

Our roads - let's make them safer

# Utilisation Strategy for Speed Camera Enforcement

Version 7  
October 2009

## Introduction

The main aim of the Staffordshire Safer Roads Partnership is to reduce road casualties. The range of measures available to the Partnership broadly includes enforcement, engineering, education, driver training and publicity.

A matrix of criteria has been developed to ensure proportionate and effective solutions are implemented in areas with a history of collisions resulting in personal injuries. These criteria are applied rigorously to make best use of all available resource.

Contrary to popular belief, speed cameras are not used to raise revenue and the Partnership does not receive any of the fines generated. The management of camera sites is based on the reduction of collisions and casualties and not on the number of offences. Current figures show that the number of people killed or seriously injured at cameras sites in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent have fallen by an average of 64% since the sites were implemented.

Speed enforcement, by both fixed and mobile cameras, is key to the work of the Partnership and provides an opportunity to re-educate some drivers through a Speed Awareness Course rather than resulting in penalty points.

## Review – Fixed and Core Mobile Camera Sites

To ensure speed cameras in Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent are used in a fair and proportionate manner an annual review will be undertaken.

A camera site is a length of road on which camera enforcement takes place. Often a site will have several camera housings or mobile locations implemented as a group. Both fixed and mobile locations may be included within the same site.

The following information will be considered during the review:

- Original justification for the implementation of the site including collisions and traffic speeds
- Collisions since the implementation of the site
- Traffic speeds at the camera housings and elsewhere in the site
- The level of offences detected at each site
- Changes to the highway

Following the annual review, one of the following recommendations will be made for each site:

- Camera site is justified
  - If there has been a minimum of 1 killed or seriously injured (KSI)<sup>1</sup> collision per km or 3 personal injury collisions (PICs)<sup>2</sup> per km during the 3 years before implementation or in the most recent 3 year period

---

<sup>1</sup> A killed or seriously injured collision includes any collision which results in serious injury or death.

<sup>2</sup> A personal injury collision includes any collision which results in an injured person regardless of the severity of injuries.

- or
  - If there has been a speeding issue either before or since implementation<sup>3</sup>
- Camera site is not justified
  - If there has not been a minimum of 1 KSI collision per km or 3 PICs per km during the 3 years before implementation or in the most recent 3 year period
  - and
    - If there was no speeding issue either before or since implementation
- Camera site has been superseded
  - If changes to the road layout or other engineering measures have made the speed camera redundant i.e. traffic calming

### Action – Fixed and Core Mobile Camera Sites

Following the annual review, each site will be actioned as follows:

- Camera site is justified
  - One of the following priorities will be allocated:
    - High
    - Medium
    - Low
  - The priorities for each site will continue to be reviewed and altered on a regular basis (see Allocating Priorities below)
- Camera site is not justified
  - See Camera Site Removal below
- Camera site has been superseded
  - See Camera Site Removal below
- Camera site is underperforming. For fixed camera sites if KSI collision reduction is less than 25% and PIC reduction is less than 33%; for mobile camera sites if KSI collision reduction and PIC reduction are both 0% or less.
  - Investigate collisions and traffic speeds
  - Consider additional or alternative collision reduction measures

Note: The collision data used is based on the complete and final data provided by the police authority for all collisions resulting in personal injury. This data is validated and released by month and is not normally complete until 3 to 6 months later.

### Allocating Priorities

The priorities will be allocated on the following basis:

- High
  - Any significant PICs within last 6 months

---

<sup>3</sup> A speeding issue is when the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed, measured over a minimum of 1 week, is at or above the Association of Chief Police Officers recommended enforcement threshold of 10% + 2mph above the speed limit. The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is the speed that 85% of traffic is travelling at or below.

- Newly implemented sites. These would remain high priority until a full 6 months of collision data was available to review, approximately 9-12 months after implementation, and the priority would then be changed as appropriate.
- Medium
  - Any significant PICs within last 6-12 months
- Low
  - Sites with no significant PICs in last 12 months
  - Community concern sites
  - Sites not justified (if they are retained following the process below)

A significant PIC would include any fatal or serious injury collision, or a speed related slight injury collision.

## Camera Site Removal – Fixed Sites

### Camera Site is Not Justified

If a camera site is not justified the site could be considered for removal using the following process.

- Consider replacement measures including financial viability and resource implications.
- Inform local residents and request their views.
- Consult with partner organisations and representatives of the community such as elected members and parish councils via a case conference (to be chaired by an individual outside the partnership management such as the Local Policing Unit commander).
- Pass the outcome of the case conference to the Partnership Governance Board for final approval.
- If the decision supports removal, bag the camera housing(s) and mark as 'Out of Use'. Publicise this in the media and implement appropriate replacement measures.
- Following a 12 month period of monitoring, review any issues and determine further actions. Further actions could include reinstating the camera housing(s), providing additional enforcement or introducing other engineering measures.
- Consult via a second case conference to gain approval for any further actions and pass these to the Governance Board for final approval.

### Camera Site has been Superseded

Staffordshire Highways and Stoke-on-Trent Highways will notify the partnership of plans to install additional engineering measures at camera sites.

If a camera site has been superseded by another engineering measure, the decision to remove the site would be made within the Partnership following in-depth analysis and recommendations by highway and road safety professionals. A formal notification would be made to partner organisations and representatives of the community but full consultation would not take place.

### Camera Site is Underperforming

If a more appropriate casualty reduction measure can be identified, an underperforming camera site may be removed and replaced. This would follow in-depth analysis and recommendations by highway and road safety professionals. A formal notification would be made to partner organisations and representatives of the community but full consultation would not take place.

### **Combined Fixed & Mobile Sites**

A combined site, including both fixed and mobile locations, would only be used if:

- Different solutions were justified for different sections of the same road
- Mobile enforcement is targeting collision or speeding hotspots identified between fixed cameras

### **Camera Site Is Not Justified – Core Mobile Sites**

If a mobile camera site is not justified a similar process would be followed as for a fixed camera site. This may result in the site being cancelled or reverting to a community concern site with a low priority.

### **Review – Community Concern Mobile Sites**

Community concern sites allow us to address the concerns of the public with a low level of mobile enforcement.

These sites are implemented where there is a significant level of concern from the community and there is evidence of a speeding issue. The collision history of the location does not have any bearing.

Community concern sites would not be implemented following a single complaint. Contact is required from a number of residents, the parish council or a community group.

As the justification for community concern sites is not based on collisions we cannot review them in the same way as fixed and core mobile sites. These sites would remain, generally as a low priority, unless there is a reason to cancel them.