

# **ENFIELD** **SCRUTINY**

## **Serving the people**

### **Speed Cameras and the London Safety Camera Partnership (LSCP) – Briefing for Environment, Parks and Leisure Scrutiny Panel – 2 December 2009**

#### **1. Background**

There are 34 speed cameras in Enfield, 17 of which are on borough roads and the other 17 on either the A10 or A406. As well as eight red light cameras all of which are on either the A10 or A406.

All safety cameras are introduced and maintained by the London Safety Camera Partnership (LSCP) consisting of the following organisations.

- Transport for London
- Metropolitan Police Service
- City of London Police
- Her Majesty's Court Service
- London Councils

All cameras are installed and maintained by the LSCP. Transport for London is the lead authority and receives a grant from the Department for Transport to fund the operation.

Before a new camera is introduced the following criteria has to be met:-

- There should be at least 4 serious or fatal injuries on the section of road concerned in the previous 3 years.

When sites, meeting the criteria, are identified on Enfield roads, the LSCP approach Council officers and discuss possible introduction of a speed camera. These proposals are then considered by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Street Scene. In recent years these proposals have tended to be rejected in favour of vehicle activated signs, which do not penalise otherwise law abiding drivers.

#### **2. Transport for London**

Transport for London have provided the following information which has been pulled together for your consideration.

Success of a camera is measured in terms of casualty reduction using KSI criteria (Killed and Seriously Injured) which were introduced in 2002.

It costs approximately £50,000 to install a camera and around £1,000 per site to maintain it.

Transport for London does not keep information on number of offences, or fines per camera, as this is not their primary purpose.

KSIs in Enfield have fallen by about 70% at sites installed by the LSCP. The attached spread sheets show the overall reduction.

The last spreadsheet shows only those safety cameras on Enfield streets, leaving out those on TfL roads, i.e. the A406 and A10. This shows that of the 11 safety camera sites on Enfield Streets all but 3 have seen a reduction in KSI. Comparing the before data on the spreadsheet to the data for 36 months after installation 23 KSI have been saved, and fatalities dropped from 5 to zero.

## **2.1 Governance Arrangements**

In 2002 London was accepted on to the Department for Transport's (DfT) Hypothecation scheme as it had demonstrated compliance with the rules set by the DfT for camera partnerships. Basically these stated that the Partnership area should be in line with police force area (in London's case, the two police forces), it should include the Courts service (now HMCS) and all highway authorities. The rules also stipulated that there should be a lead local authority, which could not be a police force that assumed the treasurer and project management functions. All partners agreed that this should be TfL.

It was agreed that the Partnership Board was to consist of any organisation that incurred costs in some part of the camera operation. In line with the DfT rules, the financial risk would be borne by the partner organisations commensurate with the budget that the organisation drew from the LSCP. The exception to this was the Association of Local Government (ALG) (now London Councils) who had a voting position on the Board without incurring costs, so in order to justify the voting right, an artificial level of risk (5%) was assumed by the ALG. The partnership operated under a Memorandum of Understanding.

The governance situation changed in April 2007 when the funding mechanism changed from a shared budget for the Partnership to TfL receiving a grant and from the DfT. This moved the operation on to one of a Partnership to a situation whereby TfL entered into contracts with the service providers (ie the two police forces and the HMCS) to operate the system and TfL carried all the financial risk. Consequently the influence of the LSCP Board altered considerably, and a new MOU is currently under consideration to reflect this.

The one element of the operation that hasn't changed in London is the application of criteria in order to assess the suitability of new sites. The new funding mechanism in 2007 also saw the end of the DfT's rule book, with policy for camera operations largely left to each individual area. However, TfL has never diluted its speed camera criteria, and because of this, London continues

to be one of the most successful operations with a casualty reduction rate of between 50% and 60% at sites introduced under the criteria.

## **2.2 Funding, Historical and Current**

From 2002 to 2007 the Partnership funding mechanism was through the hypothecation route. Prior to the beginning of a new financial year the cost incurring partners would forecast the budget they would require in order to function at a level determined by the Board for the following year. These operating costs plus an amount for capital spend (again agreed by the Board and would cover new camera sites, vehicles, computer systems etc.) would be submitted to the DfT for approval. Once approved the DfT would fund the Partnership to that amount, subject to the partnership processing enough paid tickets from camera offences to cover that budget.

If the partnership produced more than the agreed amount of tickets the extra money was withheld by central government so that partnerships did not use the mechanism to generate revenue. If the partnership failed to achieve the number of paid fines forecast (ie operated in deficit) they would be required to pay back to central government the amount of the deficit. This deficit would be divided up between the partners according to the financial liability they had assumed. This mechanism was again designed to stop revenue raising by partnerships by ensuring realistic targets were set.

To further ensure that the system could not be used for revenue raising, partnerships' success was measured on casualty reduction targets and if these were not achieved, funding would be withdrawn altogether.

Despite the mechanisms put in place to ensure the operation was not a revenue raising exercise accusations were frequently levelled at the partnerships and the DfT that the operations were just that. So in April 2007 the DfT changed the funding mechanism from hypothecation to a grant system that was not in any way linked to the number of offences processed. This process was further proof that the operations primary objective was casualty reduction.

The rest of England had a an existing mechanism for the partner areas to receive the grant and this was the LTP grant so the wider road safety grant was added to this. For London and Wales, there was no such process so for London it was agreed that the grant would be given to TfL for policy to be set and the grant to be distributed. As stated above TfL has entered into contractual

arrangements with the two police forces and the HMCS in order to keep the operation delivering on its casualty reductions.

Grant distribution is solely the responsibility of TfL and TfL would liaise with boroughs on an individual basis to try and meet their camera needs if the funds were available.

### **2.3 What the scheme costs to run and what this means for Enfield Council**

The grant for 2008/9 was £12.5M and was allocated as follows,



Enfield would benefit from enforcement at the sites in their borough from the costs associated to the first three bullet points. From the TfL allocation, £1M of this was allocated to the Communications strategy and Enfield received support from the Communication Team. TfL's Programme Office would manage maintenance of all camera sites and would undertake detailed analysis of casualty statistics on all roads in all boroughs and recommend to them any roads that might benefit from camera enforcement. It would then be a decision for the borough as to whether the camera went ahead.

The capital budget would fund any camera installations approved by any borough. This budget was not formally divided up and TfL would attempt to allocate it according to need ie. the potential sites that could achieve the best casualty reduction results.

LSCP has also worked with the Enfield Casualty Reduction Partnership and Enfield Safe Drive Stay Alive Steering Group for a number of years. During this time the LSCP's Communication Team have worked alongside Enfield's Road Safety Team, the Metropolitan Police, London Fire Brigade and London Ambulance Service to provide educational and community events and resources throughout Enfield. In particular:

- **Enfield Town Centre Speed Awareness Day 2006** – LSCP visited Enfield Town Centre with their community trailer, providing advice and resources to the local community.
- **Safe Drive Stay Alive 2008** – LSCP are a member of the steering group for this project and have provided support, advice and guidance over a number of years. In particular, the LSCP were involved in producing post-SDSA educational resources which have been used by all schools involved in SDSA. LSCP also developed a new resource, 'Parent Pact', for parents of new and young drivers. LSCP invited Enfield Road Safety Team to be involved in the development of this resource so that it could be issued to young people attending SDSA. The LSCP funded the development and production 'Parent Pact'.

LSCP also funded a bespoke 'Enfield SDSA' edition of FirstCar Magazine and paid for each student attending SDSA to receive a copy of FirstCar Magazine polywrapped with a 'Parent Pact' resource.

- **Safe Drive Stay Alive 2009** – LSCP continue to be a steering group member and will be making the same financial and resource contributions as for 2008.
- **Enfield Town Show 2008 and 2009** – LSCP attended the 2008 show (and will attend the 2009 show) with an educational trailer full of display, interactive games and free educational resources.

## 2.4 Benefits and drawbacks

The assessed benefits are in the casualty reductions achieved by the partnership which runs at over 50% reduction in KSIs across all sites installed by the LSCP. The only significant drawback is that the amount of grant for capital spend after operational costs are removed is not enough to achieve greater casualty reductions.

## 2.5 Research available that assesses the value of the LSCP

The LSCP Board measures its own value in the number of casualties it saves on London's roads. This is currently estimated at around 500 KSIs a year. If a monetary value was applied to this, the DfT puts a value of c.£250,000 on a KSI, so the annual saving would be in the region of £125M, which is in monetary terms around a return of 10:1. This compares very favourably with all other road safety interventions, and probably the most effective.

## 2.6 Justification for positioning

Under the LSCP cameras have only been installed where there has been a history of collisions either at speed or red light running. These criteria are listed below and were introduced in April 2002 when the camera partnership structure started. It is these criteria that have been the biggest single factor in reducing casualties around camera locations. All cameras installed since 2002 met the criteria at the time of application to the DfT for installation.

Camera criteria is based on the number of collisions involving fatal and serious injuries. This is so that LSCP resources are concentrated on speed and red light camera sites with the highest casualty history.

- **Speed Camera**

In the most recent 36 month period there must be a collision history along the length of road of: 4 KSI collisions, 2 of which must be speed related.

- **Combined Red Light and Speed Camera (speed on green)**

In the most recent 36 month period there must be a collision history at the junction and on the same arm of: 2 speed related KSI collisions and 2 other personal injury collisions (slight) caused by a vehicle 'Disobeying Automatic Traffic Signals' (jumping a red light).

- **Time Distance Speed Cameras**

In the most recent 36 month period there must be: 4 or more KSI collisions per kilometre of carriageway, 2 of which must be speed related.

- **Mobile Speed Cameras**

Mobile enforcement sites and operational activity is selected through Metropolitan Police Tasking Meetings.

- **Red Light Camera**

In the most recent 36 month period there must be a collision history at the junction, and on the same arm, of: 1 KSI collision and 1 other personal injury collision (slight). Both of these collisions must have been caused by a vehicle 'Disobeying Automatic Traffic Signals' (jumping a red light).

## 2.7 Before and after statistics

Below is a summary table of the KSI numbers for the 36 months before and after a camera was installed. It is further broken down for cameras installed before the LSCP started (April 2002) and the period since (when the above criteria was used). Full casualty details can be seen in Appendix I.

Evidence would appear to indicate that the cameras installed since the Partnership was formed have been more successful than previously, as installations have been focussed on areas where injuries occurred due to speeding and red light running.

		BEFORE LSCP (To 2001)			LSCP (2002 - 2008)		
		Before	After	%age Change	Before	After	%age Change
Red Light Cameras (number of KSIs)		20	18	-10	-	-	-
Speed Cameras (number of KSIs)		26	34	31	22	6	-73

## 2.8 Fines income per camera

This information has never been collected as the results would be largely meaningless. The success of a camera is based on its ability to reduce casualties.

## 2.9 Alternatives considered

The LSCP has always considered enforcement to be the “last resort” intervention. When camera requests are received, one of the questions asked of the borough is what other measures have been considered.

## 2.10 Outcomes of camera removal

From a casualty reduction stand point removal of the cameras could be seen to have a negative affect on reducing casualties. There are no positives from removing a camera that has seen casualty reductions. Cameras that have shown an increase would need to be investigated thoroughly in order to

understand whether the rise could be attributed to the camera or whether the rise is down to other factors.

### **3. Detailed analysis of 4 cameras**

The following is a detailed analysis of four cameras where the killed and seriously injured indicator has increased since the introduction of the camera.

#### **3.1 A110/ Southbury Road/ A10/ Great Cambridge Road (Red light camera)**

**Year Installed: 1994**

**KSI collisions before: 0**

**KSI collisions after: 3 (0 fatal, 3 serious)**

**Change in KSI collisions +3**

**Location:** The red light enforcement camera is in the eastern arm of Southbury Road enforcing traffic heading westbound.

#### **Serious collisions in the 36 month 'after' period**

- (1) The first serious collision involved 3 vehicle travelling N-S. The first vehicle stopped because of a fire engine on an emergency call. The 2 vehicles behind then shunted the car in front.
- (2) The second collision involved a car travelling W-E which was in collision with a pedal cyclist who rode across the shared-use crossing N-S.
- (3) The third serious collision involved a car travelling N-S which was in collision with a pedestrian crossing eastbound.

**Conclusion:** In the 36 months after the camera was installed there were no KSI collisions involving drivers disobeying the ATS.

#### **3.2 A10/ Great Cambridge Road/ north of Crown Road - Speed cameras (2)**

**Year installed: 1995**

**KSI collisions before: 0**

**KSI collisions after: 5 (0 fatal, 5 serious)**

**Change in KSI collisions: +5**

**Location:** There are 2 speed cameras, one speed camera located on the southbound carriageway north of Crown Road, immediately before the exit from the car auction site. There is a northbound camera level with the Homebase store.

#### **Serious collisions in the 36 month 'after' period**

- (1) The first serious collision involved a northbound car and a pedestrian (school child) near to Cambridge Gardens which is 670 metres away from the northbound camera.
- (2) The second collision involved 1 vehicle travelling southbound (18 year-old driver). The driver lost control and the car hit a lamp column. This was 500m north of Southbury Road. This was approximately 200m south of the southbound camera.
- (3) At a point 100m north of Crown Road (in the vicinity of the car auction), a car turned left across the path of a southbound motorcycle.
- (4) At a point 30m north of Crown Road a northbound car driver (aged 19) braked hard, went into a skid and overturned the vehicle. This was about 110m before the speed camera. It appears that the driver was travelling too fast.
- (5) Near to the Car Auction a northbound car collided with a pedestrian who 'walked into the nearside of the car'.

**Conclusion:** From the collision locations and descriptions, it appears the collisions cannot be attributed to the location of the speed cameras. This was before the cameras were made more conspicuous with the addition of yellow reflective panels.

### **3.3 A406/ North Circular Road/ near Cross Street - Speed camera (1)**

**Year installed:** 2000

**KSI collisions before:** 0

**KSI collisions after:** 5 (2 fatal, 3 serious)

**Change in KSI collisions:** +5

**Location:** The camera is on the westbound carriageway at the start of the off-slip and the entrance to the Edmonton Tunnel.

#### **Serious collisions in the 36 month 'after' period**

- (1) The fatal collision in May 2000 involved an eastbound car. For no apparent reason the driver lost control.
- (2) The second fatal collision, in January 2003 involved a pedestrian who 'leapt' into the path of a westbound bus/ coach.
- (3) In October 2000 a pedestrian crossed the North Circular and was hit by a westbound van. The location was described as '20m NE of the junction with Fore Street' which would make it either in the tunnel approach or near the stop line at the traffic signals at the end of the off-slip.
- (4) A shunt collision occurred in October 2000. A car being driven 'too fast' collided with stationary vehicles. It is not clear whether this was at the tunnel entrance or on the slip road.

- (5) In March 2002 a car pursued by the police which was on the wrong carriageway collided with on-coming vehicles on the eastbound carriageway.

**Conclusion:** 2 KSI collisions including the fatal were on the opposite carriageway. 2 collisions involved pedestrians. 2 collisions appear to have been either near the tunnel entrance or the junction with Fore Street. In conclusion the camera could have been an influence in only 2 of the 5 collisions (i.e. 3 and 4 above). The 'after' period was prior to the camera being made more conspicuous with the addition of yellow reflective panels.

### **3.4 Great Cambridge Road/ by Westerham Avenue Speed camera (1) southbound**

**Year installed:** 1995

**KSI collisions before:** 1 (fatal)

**KSI collisions after:** 0

**KSI collisions in most recent 36 months:** 5 (1 fatal and 4 serious)

**Change in KSI collisions:** +4

**Location:** A10 Great Cambridge Road immediately north of Westerham Road, southbound carriageway.

#### **Fatal collision before installation:**

- (1) A southbound light goods vehicle collided with a parked light goods vehicle at 10 yards north of the Deansway which is 280m north of where the camera was installed.

#### **KSI collisions after installation:**

- (1) The fatal collision was on the opposite carriageway (i.e. northbound). A motorcycle collided with a car.
- (2) The first serious collision (Feb 2006) involved southbound vehicles and was approximately 370m before the speed camera.
- (3) The second serious collision involved 3 northbound cars (opposite carriageway) as a consequence of lane-changing.
- (4) The third involved 2 cars northbound (opposite carriageway); one hit the rear of the other.
- (5) The fourth involved southbound vehicles. Two drivers appear to have been racing and both lost control and collided. The location was 190m in advance of the speed camera.

**Conclusion:** The fatal collision and 2 serious collisions were on the opposite carriageway and therefore the camera could not be considered to have been any influence. The earlier collision on the southbound carriageway was some distance before the camera. It is unlikely that the collision was in response to the location of the camera. In the second of the serious collisions on the

southbound carriageway it is clear that the two drivers were racing each other, and racing has become commonplace on the A10 in recent years. A camera has now been installed on the northbound carriageway.

#### **4. Comments raised by organisations opposed to the cameras**

##### **4.1 Speedcameras.org**

While the spreadsheet of casualty figures shows an overall reduction of KSI incidents, this is of no comfort to the families of those who have died or been seriously injured at locations where KSIs have increased since cameras were installed.

For example the camera at A110/ Southbury Road/ A10/ Great Cambridge Road has seen 3 additional KSIs in the period of 36 months after the camera was installed and another 3 KSIs in the most recent 36 months. Before the camera was in place there were zero KSIs. If we are to assume the spreadsheet is accurate then this camera has overseen the needless serious injury of 6 people in 6 years. So why has this camera not been removed if there were no KSIs before the camera was installed? It appears the camera has caused accidents at this specific location that may not have occurred if the camera wasn't there.

The cameras at A10/ Great Cambridge Road/ north of Crown Road also saw an increase of KSIs in the 36 months after they were installed. The same too for the camera at A406/ North Circular Road/ near Cross Street. Why have several cameras that have made virtually no difference or seen an increase in KSIs not been removed? This is not in the public interest, and certainly not for the people who were killed or injured under the nose of these cameras. It is preposterous that these are referred to as "Safety Cameras". Instead "Accident Cameras" would be more accurate. Is it any wonder that the public see cameras as an easy way for authorities to generate a financial income and to meet targets in criminalising motorists?

The 3 fixed digital cameras installed in 2007 have seen accident casualties rocket by 70% from 26 to 44. (This compares fatal, serious and slight casualties 36 months prior to the cameras being installed to the relatively short period to Nov 2008 after the cameras were installed in 2007. Clearly this shows accidents have rapidly increased from the moment the cameras were put in place. No wonder these figures have been greyed out in the spreadsheet and excluded from the overall results. Either this type of camera is wholly inappropriate or the locations are a serious misjudgement. The cameras should be removed before any more people are needlessly involved in an accident. A 70% increase over such a short time represents a huge failure and allowing further accidents to take place by not removing the cameras is cruelly negligent and possibly criminal.

Credit for where accidents have decreased should not automatically be assigned to speed cameras. The improved safety of modern vehicles and better medical care both at the scene of accidents and in hospitals are to thank for the

decline in KSIs. All new cars have ABS and many have automatic stability control, particularly the more powerful vehicles, which result in short breaking distances and a more controllable vehicle at higher speeds, around corners and in adverse weather conditions. Newer safety technology such as improved pedestrian impact zones help reduce KSIs to pedestrians and multiple airbags inside vehicles help better protect occupants sitting in both the back and front from both front and side impacts. Newer cars are safer and better protect pedestrians and occupants, thus accidents are limited or reduced and the outcome of injuries have also been reduced through huge investments in R&D by the motor industry who have made many new and premium features become part of the standard specification on more modern cars. Many people owe their lives and limbs to these advancements.

Critically, the focus on "speeding" as being a major cause of accidents is a complete folly. Department for Transport (DfT) figures revealed that only 5% of all accidents are caused by exceeding the speed limit. Therefore 95% of all accidents have nothing to do with exceeding the speed limit. If the authorities focused their resources and efforts more on the other 95% of accidents then simple maths shows they could potentially reduce by a factor of 20 times the number of accidents we currently have on British roads. The main contributing factors from 2005 DfT figures are as follows:

- Failed to look properly: 32%
- Bad behaviour or inexperience: 25%
- Misjudged other drivers speed/path: 18%
- Poor turn/manoeuvre: 15%
- Going too fast for conditions (NOT necessarily exceeding the speed limit):
  - 12%
  - Loss of control: 14%
  - Vision affected: 10%
  - Slippery road: 10%
  - Following too close: 7%
  - Sudden braking: 7%
  - Disobeyed traffic signal or stop sign: 6%
  - Impaired by alcohol: 5%
  - EXCEEDING SPEED LIMIT: 5%
  - Road layout: 3%
  - Vehicle defects: 2%

There are no automated roadside devices capable of detecting drivers experiencing 12 of the above 15 conditions. If more resources were put into educating drivers and improving roads then the majority of accidents will become preventable. But until the authorities stop relying on speed cameras to reduce accidents they fail to address the cause of 95% of all accidents.

The 2007 figures (the latest available) show that the story has changed very slightly. 6% of all accidents were caused by exceeding the speed limit, up from 5% in 2 years. This suggests speed cameras have failed to reduce the number

of people exceeding the speed limit and as a result more accidents are caused by this! The very thing that speed cameras are supposed to reduce!

Travelling too fast for the road conditions has gone down from 12% to 10% which suggests drivers have become slightly more sensible in selecting an appropriate speed for the road conditions.

I hope this facts help explain that speed cameras do not work, they cannot by any stretch of the imagination have any impact on any more than 6% of all road accidents, in recent years exceeding the speed limit has caused more accidents (not less!), some cameras have caused more accidents (by up to 70%), resources must be redirected to focus on preventing the other 94% of accidents that have nothing to do with exceeding the speed limit.

Far more accidents can be prevented by looking at the facts published by the DfT and taking note of the evidence.

#### **4.2 Questions raised by Safespeed.org:-**

Using the data from the Partnership, especially the analysis of the sites where KSI have increased following camera installation.

The Partnership explains why the post-installation collisions and casualties could not be attributed to the cameras. That is very interesting but is tantamount to saying that the camera is having no effect.

Cameras are nearly always installed following a series of collisions or casualties, usually within a specific time period.

Please provide examples of pre-installation incidents where it could credibly be argued that the camera would have prevented them.

The point being that if it cannot be argued that the camera would have prevented one or all of the pre-installation collisions there is no reason to suppose that it will have any effect on post-installation collisions (the argument that the camera is having no effect can be used both ways).

We should not be interested in whether a camera did not cause (or contribute to) a collision. A recent Highways Agency report confirmed that cameras introduce hazards such as sudden braking and distraction.

How can cameras prevent collisions.?

It is often said that "cameras save lives" or "cameras prevent collisions" but, without a credible example, such claims can be seen to be unfounded.

Falls in casualties and collisions at camera sites after an atypically high incident rate for a number of reasons (mostly statistical trends) - there is no convincing evidence that a camera would or could ever prevent a collision.