

<b>11 December 2013</b>		<b>ITEM: 12</b> <b>01104254</b>
<b>Cabinet</b>		
<b>Update On CCTV Enforcement Vehicle Trial</b>		
<b>Report of:</b> Councillor A Gaywood, Portfolio Holder for Public Protection		
<b>Wards and communities affected:</b> All	<b>Key Decision:</b> Key	
<b>Accountable Head of Service:</b> Basil Jackson, Interim Head of Transportation and Highways		
<b>Accountable Director:</b> David Bull, Director of Planning and Transportation		
<b>This report is</b> Public		
<b>Purpose of Report:</b> To provide Cabinet with an update on the CCTV enforcement vehicle trial and to recommend a way forward.		

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Last October Cabinet approved a 6-month trial of a CCTV enforcement vehicle in Thurrock. The main purpose of the trial was to gauge the effectiveness of a CCTV enforcement vehicle in Thurrock based on real experience via any improvement to problems caused by inconsiderately and dangerously parked vehicles, especially near schools. This in turn would enable an informed decision to be made on the future of mobile enforcement in the Borough.

The 6-month trial commenced in June 2013 and at the time this report was compiled the vehicle had been in operation for 5 months (June – mid-November).

This report provides a breakdown of the penalty charge notices (PCNs) that have been issued during this initial 5 months of operation and highlights the improvement to the enforcement of school-related parking contraventions.

It also provides an estimate of the amount of revenue that could be generated from these PCNs, based upon historic collection trends and gives financial projections of the costs of continuing mobile enforcement beyond the trial, either through purchasing or continuing to lease the CCTV enforcement vehicle. It then compares this revenue with the costs to give projected budget surplus.

The report concludes that the 6-month trial has indicated that a CCTV enforcement vehicle is an effective method of dealing with problems caused by inconsiderately and dangerously parked vehicles near schools, and that based on the revenue generated during the initial 5 months of the trial, a business case could be made for continuing mobile enforcement in Thurrock.

This report recommends that this is done by purchasing the vehicle that has been leased for the 6-month trial.

## **1. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 1.1 That Cabinet approves the continuation of mobile enforcement in Thurrock through the purchase of the CCTV enforcement vehicle that was leased for the 6-month trial.**

## **2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND:**

- 2.1 On 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012, Cabinet approved a 6-month trial of a CCTV enforcement vehicle in Thurrock. The main purpose of the trial was to gauge the effectiveness of a CCTV enforcement vehicle in Thurrock based on real experience via any improvement to problems caused by inconsiderately and dangerously parked vehicles, especially near schools, where enforcement by civil enforcement officers on foot patrols has historically been difficult.
- 2.2 The trial has also enabled the cost-effectiveness of operating such a vehicle in Thurrock to be gauged, by comparing the operational costs with the revenue generated from penalty charge notices (PCNs) issued for parking contraventions identified from evidence gathered by the vehicle, which in turn would enable an informed decision to be made on the future of mobile enforcement in the Borough, based on real experience.
- 2.3 Officers explored various options for operating the vehicle in liaison with the Portfolio Holder for Public Protection, and commissioned the Council's Strategic Services Partner, Serco, to facilitate the trial. The commission included the hire and maintenance of a fully-fitted, liveried CCTV enforcement vehicle, the provision of the appropriate software, the integration and configuration of the equipment with the existing parking management system, and the additional back office support required for penalty charge notices generated during the trial period. It also included the certification of the complete system as an "approved device" with the Vehicle Certification Agency (VCA).
- 2.4 Prior to the start of the trial, a communications strategy was put in place, which included publicity in the local media, and engagement with key stakeholders, including local schools. Local school children were also asked to participate in a naming competition for the vehicle, from which the apt name PIPPA (Park It Properly Prevent Accidents) was selected as the winning entry.
- 2.5 For 2-3 weeks before the trial, warning notices were issued by post on the back of evidence of parking contraventions gathered by PIPPA instead of penalty charge notices, to increase awareness that parking restrictions and regulations in Thurrock were about to be enforced in a different way.

- 2.6 The 6-month trial commenced on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2013 and, since then, PIPPA been used to augment the role of the civil enforcement officer foot patrols, by being deployed to locations that are remote or not on existing CEO beats.

### **THE OBJECTIVE OF CCTV ENFORCEMENT**

- 2.7 The primary use of PIPPA during the trial has been to support the work of the School Safety Working Group by improving the safety of school children through the more effective and efficient enforcement of dangerous parking, particularly near the Borough's primary schools. PIPPA has also been used to improve the safety and efficient movement of traffic by enforcing parking contraventions at bus stops, clearways, taxi ranks and in sections of road where both waiting and loading is prohibited, as well as certain heavy goods vehicle restrictions.
- 2.8 In the future, it is hoped that PIPPA could also be used to enforce bus lanes and to support the enforcement of controlled parking zones/permit parking areas.

### **OUTCOME OF CCTV ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE TRIAL**

- 2.9 During the initial 5 months of the trial (June – November), the CCTV enforcement vehicle, PIPPA has gathered CCTV evidence of various parking contraventions. Based on these contraventions, penalty charge notices were issued by post to the keepers/owners of the vehicles in accordance with Regulation 10 of the Civil Enforcement of Parking Contraventions (England) General Regulations 2007.
- 2.10 Appendix 1 of this report lists the parking contraventions codes that have been enforced during the trial and provides a breakdown of the 1,541 PCNs that were issued during the initial 5 months of the trial. During this period, PIPPA made 719 visits to Thurrock schools during the morning and afternoon school runs (term-time only). Two hundred and thirty-eight school-related parking contraventions were recorded (of which 107 were for vehicles stopped in a restricted area outside a school), from which PCNs were issued. These visits were supplemented by 128 visits by civil enforcement officers on foot patrols, from which a further 48 penalty charge notices were issued for school-related parking contraventions.
- 2.11 By comparison, a total of 76 penalty charge notices were issued by civil enforcement officers on foot patrols to vehicles stopped in a restricted area outside a school in the entire 3-year period from 2010/11 to 2012/13. Hence, based on this statistic alone, PIPPA could be seen to be an effective method of dealing with parking problems near schools.
- 2.12 All of the parking contraventions enforced by PIPPA attract the higher band rate of £70 (discounted to £35 if paid within 14 days), due to the severity of parking contraventions concerned. Table 1 below gives the projected revenue from the 6-month trial, by extrapolating the PCN figures for the initial 5 months for the entire 6 month period of the trial (by applying a multiplier of 1.2) and estimating the amount of revenue that would be generated for the entire 6-month trial, based upon historic penalty charge collection trends.

**Table 1 – Projected Revenue**

No. of PCNs Issued During Initial 5-Months of Trial	Projected No. of PCNs Issued During 6-Month Trial	Revenue per PCN Based on Historic Collection Trends	Projected PCN Revenue from 6-Month Trial	Annual Projected PCN Revenue
1,541	1,849	£28.45	£52,604 (Estimate)	£105,208 (Estimate)

2.13 The estimated cost of the 6-month trial is £130,340, and is comprised of £76,090 initial set up (capital) costs, and £54,250 lease/operational (revenue) costs. Based on the projected revenue in Table 1, it is estimated that there will be a £77,736 budget shortfall on the 6-month trial. This is mainly due to the high set up (capital) costs. This shortfall will be financed from within the Planning and Transportation overall budget.

2.14 Table 2a provides a financial projection of the annual capital and revenue costs of continuing mobile enforcement beyond the 6-month trial through the purchase of the CCTV enforcement vehicle that was leased for the trial, and compares these costs with the projected PCN revenue, to give the projected annual budget shortfall:

**Table 2a – Continued Operation - Purchase Option**

Annualised Cost of Purchasing Vehicle Spread over a 3-year period	Annual Estimated Revenue Cost of Operating Purchased Vehicle	Annual Estimated Capital/Revenue Costs of Operating Purchased Vehicle	Annual Estimated PCN Revenue	Annual Estimated Budget Shortfall
£14,000	£95,000	£109,000	£105,208 (Estimate)	£3,800 (Estimate)

2.15 Table 2b provides a financial projection of the annual revenue costs of continuing mobile enforcement beyond the 6-month trial through the continued lease of the CCTV enforcement vehicle that was leased for the trial, and compares these costs with the projected PCN revenue, to give the projected annual budget surplus.

**Table 2b – Continued Operation - Lease Option**

<b>Annual Revenue Cost of Continuing to Lease the Vehicle</b>	<b>Annual Estimated Revenue Cost of Operating Leased</b>	<b>Annual Estimated Revenue Costs of Leasing/ Operating Leased Vehicle</b>	<b>Annual Estimated PCN Revenue</b>	<b>Annual Estimated Budget Shortfall</b>
£23,100	£95,000	£118,100	£105,208 (Estimate)	£12,900 (Estimate)

2.16 Based on the financial projections contained in Tables 2a and 2b, the budget shortfall for the continued operation of mobile enforcement beyond the 6-month trial would be much smaller if the vehicle used for the trial was to be purchased.

### **3. ISSUES AND ANALYSIS OF OPTIONS:**

#### **Issues**

3.1 The calculations made in Tables 1, 2a and 2b above are based on certain assumptions about the level of revenue from penalty charge notices, which are detailed in Appendix 2 of this report.

#### **Options**

3.2 The main options are:

- Cease mobile enforcement after the 6-months trial
- Extend the CCTV enforcement vehicle trial
- Share a vehicle with another authority
- Purchase or lease of a CCTV enforcement vehicle

3.3 With an identified need to improve safety outside of the Borough's schools, it is not considered acceptable to cease the mobile enforcement after the 6-month trial. The data obtained from the trial indicates that there is a strong case for the continuation of mobile enforcement. Based on the financial projections in the report, there is a business case for purchasing or leasing a CCTV enforcement vehicle over a 3 year period. An extension of the trial would therefore simply give rise to unnecessary additional costs.

3.4 Sharing a vehicle with another authority would give rise to inefficiencies, due to the logistical difficulties and lost operational time associated with transferring the vehicle and staff between operating centres. In addition, there would be many occasions when both authorities would require the use of the

vehicle for the same purposes, such as for the enforcement of parking contraventions at schools.

- 3.5 Based on the financial projections contained in the report, the budget shortfall for the continued operation of mobile enforcement beyond the 6-month trial would be minimal if the vehicle used for the trial was to be purchased. The in-vehicle equipment could also be transferred to a new vehicle, after the 3 years, as opposed to purchasing a new fully-fitted vehicle, thereby reducing the ongoing costs, and the vehicle itself would also have a small resale value, which would help to offset any budget shortfall.

#### **4. CONCLUSIONS**

- 4.1 The trial has shown that a CCTV enforcement vehicle is an effective method of dealing with problems caused by inconsiderately and dangerously parked vehicles near schools.
- 4.2 Based on the financial projections contained in the report, a CCTV enforcement vehicle could be operated at a minimal cost beyond the 6-month trial if the vehicle used for the trial was to be purchased. Going forward, there would also be savings if the same vehicle is kept in service for longer than 3 years beyond the trial, or if the in-vehicle equipment was to be transferred to a new vehicle.

#### **5 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:**

- 5.1 Based on the financial projections contained in the report, the recommendation to purchase of the CCTV enforcement vehicle that was leased for the 6-month trial would be the most cost-effective way of continuing mobile enforcement in Thurrock.

#### **6. CONSULTATION (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)**

- 6.1 A communications strategy for the trial has already been developed and implemented, in liaison with the School Safety Working Group.
- 6.2 This included press releases, engagement with key stakeholders, including schools, and a competition to name the enforcement vehicle with local school children.
- 6.3 If the decision is taken to extend the trial, a further communications strategy will be developed and implemented.

#### **7. IMPACT ON CORPORATE POLICIES, PRIORITIES, PERFORMANCE AND COMMUNITY IMPACT**

- 7.1 The CCTV enforcement vehicle trial relates directly to the corporate priority of providing a safe, clean and green environment.

7.2 Thurrock Council's Parking Strategy 2007 contains policies relating to the enforcement of heavy goods vehicle parking hotspots (Policy TPS05) and bus lanes/taxi ranks (TPS12a), and school parking (TPS12b).

## **8. IMPLICATIONS**

### **8.1 Financial**

Implications verified by: **Astra Olinski**  
Telephone and email: **01375 652449**  
**aolinski@thurrock.gov.uk**

The estimated annual capital and revenue costs of continuing mobile enforcement beyond the 6-month trial through the purchase of the CCTV enforcement vehicle used for the trial is £109,000.

It is anticipated that the income generated by penalty charge notices issued on the back of evidence generated by the vehicle will offset a proportion of this cost. Based on the financial projections in the report, this could be in the region of £105,208, leaving a budget shortfall of £3,792.

Any shortfall would need to be financed from within the Planning and Transportation overall budget.

In the event that the income was to exceed the costs, any surplus could be invested in the transportation service (in accordance with S.55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, as amended).

The various elements of the project have been procured in accordance with the Council's Contract and Procurement Rules.

### **8.2 Legal**

Implications verified by: **Alison Stuart**  
Telephone and email: **01375 652040**  
**alison.stuart@bdtlegal.org.uk**

Broadly, the enforcement of traffic regulations using CCTV cameras is regulated under the following legislation:

- Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984
- Road Traffic Act 1991
- Traffic Management Act 2004

Together these Acts allow Thurrock Council to install structures and equipment on or near a highway for the detection of contraventions of the Traffic Regulation Orders. They will be able to use the information provided by them to serve a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) on the registered keeper of a vehicle which contravenes the Traffic Regulations.

In order to enable PCNs to be issued for contraventions detected with a camera and associated recording equipment, it was necessary to obtain certification from the Secretary of State to use this device to detect these contraventions as an 'approved device'.

In accordance with the Operational Guidance to Local Authorities (in relation to the Traffic Management Act 2004) a Code of Practice, which sets out the objectives of the system and the rules it will follow, was produced. The code ensures that staff deals properly with issues such as privacy, integrity and fairness. It sets minimum standards to help ensure public confidence in the scheme. A communications strategy was also put in place before actual CCTV enforcement commences.

Procedures were also put in place to preserve the integrity of evidence from CCTV cameras and handle and store it securely. The procedures should satisfy the community over the competence and honesty of the system and its operators. They should also reassure the community over the privacy of private areas and domestic buildings and comply with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998.

The operation of the equipment accords with the Human Rights Act 1998, and the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

### 8.3 **Diversity and Equality**

Implications verified by: **Samson DeAlyn**  
Telephone and email: **01375652472**  
**Sdealyn@thurrock.gov.uk**

There are no direct diversity and equality implications associated with the procurement of the CCTV enforcement vehicle trial.

However, the trial is being operated in accordance with the requirements and principles of the Human Rights Act 1998, and the Information Commissioners Office notification has been updated.

The internally managed IT systems, including data, personal information or otherwise held on network comply with the Data Protection Act 1998.

### 8.4 **Other implications (where significant) – i.e. Section 17, Risk Assessment, Health Impact Assessment, Sustainability, IT, Environmental**

If the penalty charge notice income from the CCTV enforcement vehicle during the extended trial is lower than the set up and operating costs, the shortfall would have to be financed from within the Planning and Transportation overall budget.

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT:**

- Estimate from the Strategic Services Partner



## **APPENDICES TO THIS REPORT:**

- Appendix 1 – 5-Month CCTV Penalty Charge Notice Summary - By Week/ Contravention Code
- Appendix 2 – Assumptions made in the penalty charge notice revenue calculations contained in this report.

## **Report Author Contact Details:**

**Name:** Jeremy Clark

**Telephone:** 01375 652968

**E-mail:** jeclark@thurrock.gov.uk

## APPENDIX 1 – 5-Month CCTV Penalty Charge Notice Summary - By Week/Contravention Code

### June/July - School Term

CC (See Overleaf for Code Details) W/C	02j	26j	27j	45j	46j	47j	48j	56j	61j	99j	Totals
03/06/2013	2	0	0	0	25	0	0	5	3	0	35
10/06/2013	0	0	0	0	26	0	4	6	4	0	40
17/06/2013	1	0	0	0	14	6	7	6	5	0	39
24/06/2013	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	8
01/07/2013	7	2	5	1	7	1	19	12	4	0	58
08/07/2013	4	0	2	4	14	2	13	17	10	1	67
15/07/2013	1	0	2	0	12	8	8	0	6	0	37
22/07/2013*	5	6	6	0	1	4	13	2	10	1	48
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>332</b>

\* Last 2 days of school term

### July/August – School Holidays

22/07/2013**	20	0	0	4	14	1	0	10	3	0	52
29/07/2013	17	2	0	1	12	1	0	3	16	1	53
05/08/2013	33	1	1	1	11	3	0	19	10	0	79
12/08/2013	37	3	2	2	15	6	0	35	25	1	126
19/08/2013	41	2	2	3	17	2	0	21	25	0	113
26/08/2013	21	0	1	0	16	1	0	2	7	0	48
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>471</b>

\*\* First 2 days of school holidays

### September/October – School Term

02/09/2013	24	0	2	5	12	5	6	14	12	0	80
09/09/2013	22	0	2	2	9	2	6	3	8	0	54
16/09/2013	43	5	12	5	16	3	15	8	13	1	121
23/09/2013	41	8	5	4	19	2	14	27	20	1	141
30/09/2013	16	6	5	2	13	8	11	4	12	1	78
07/10/2013	21	0	3	4	12	1	4	2	6	0	53
14/10/2013	39	2	9	5	19	5	19	9	13	0	120
21/10/2013	19	2	9	3	14	7	13	3	7	14	91
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>738</b>

### GRAND TOTALS - Initial 5-Months of Trial

CC	02j	26j	27j	45j	46j	47j	48j	56j	61j	99j	Totals
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1,541</b>

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **CCTV Contravention Code Key**

<b>Code</b>	<b>Contravention</b>
2j	Parked or loading/unloading in a restricted street where waiting and loading/unloading restrictions are in force
26j	Vehicle parked more than 50cm from the edge of the carriageway and not within a designated parking space
27j	Parking adjacent to a dropped footway
45j	Parked on a taxi rank
46j	Stopped where prohibited (on a red route or clearway)
47j	Stopped on a restricted bus stop or stand
48j	Stopped in a restricted area outside a school
56j	Parked in contravention of a commercial vehicle waiting restriction
61j	A heavy commercial vehicle wholly or partly parked on a footway, verge or land between two carriageways
99j	Stopped at a pedestrian crossing and/or crossing area

## **APPENDIX 2 – Assumptions made in the penalty charge notice (PCN) revenue calculations contained in this report.**

- The PCN projections are based on the PCN levels achieved during the initial 5 months of the 6 month trial. These PCNs were issued in the Summer/Autumn, and may not have taken into consideration any seasonal variations that may exist in the Winter months.
- The revenue projections are based on the assumption that the amount of revenue generated from PCNs accords with historic collection trends. These collection trends included PCNs issued to foreign-registered vehicles, which have historically been difficult to recover. For operational reasons, the CCTV enforcement vehicle has not been enforcing the parking contraventions that foreign-registered vehicles mainly tend to contravene in Thurrock. It is therefore possible that the collection trends will be higher than the historic collection trends.

Since the start of the trial, discussions have taken place with other similar unitary authorities that operate CCTV enforcement vehicles and these have indicated that PCN numbers could reduce with time, as a result of increased compliance of parking restrictions. However, there was no evidence of this during the first 5 months of the trial.